

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLAND of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 11972) for the relief of the heirs, assigns, and legal representatives of Peter Lisman; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. FOCHT: A bill (H. R. 11973) granting an increase of pension to Caroline Candus Criswell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOULD: A bill (H. R. 11974) granting a pension to Emma A. Carl; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McPHERSON: A bill (H. R. 11975) granting a pension to Mary L. Speer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11976) granting a pension to Cora Wilhite; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11977) granting a pension to Francis S. Gooding; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11978) granting a pension to Martha Kallay; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MICHENER: A bill (H. R. 11979) granting a pension to Elsie V. Reinhart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOORE of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 11980) granting a pension to Mary A. Wylie; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORGAN: A bill (H. R. 11981) granting a pension to Adelaide Thacker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPEAKS: A bill (H. R. 11982) granting an increase of pension to S. Harriet Morris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5960. By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of R. W. Kingsley, 43 East Thirty-eighth Street, New York City, urging that before the United States as a Nation may declare war on any other nation the issue must first be submitted to voters of the Republic for their affirmative approval or disapproval; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5961. Also (by request), resolution adopted by the Greater Chicago Federation, urging the third Sunday in June to be designated as Mothers' Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5962. Also (by request), resolution passed by the council of the city of Pittsburgh, urging Congress to take early action for complete canalization of the Ohio River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

5963. By Mr. CAREW: Resolution passed by the council of the city of Pittsburgh, urging Congress to complete the canalization of the Ohio River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

5964. By Mr. CRAGO: Resolution adopted by the city council of Pittsburgh, urging that early action be taken for complete canalization of the Ohio River as planned by the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

5965. By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee: Resolution of the Tennessee State Dental Society, indorsing Ford's offer for Muscle Shoals; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

5966. By Mr. KISSEL: Petition of Biochemical Food Products Corporation, Chicago, Ill., relative to freight rates; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5967. Also, petition of Henry Ford, of Dearborn, Mich., relative to his offer for Muscle Shoals; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

5968. Also, petition of city clerk, Pittsburgh, Pa., transmitting resolution adopted by the council of the city of Pittsburgh, urging Congress to take early action for complete canalization of the Ohio River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

5969. By Mr. MACGREGOR: Petition of Kate L. Weed and Edith Weed, of Buffalo, urging the United States to do all that justice and mercy require in behalf of the afflicted nation of Armenia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5970. Also, petition of John W. Wargin, deputy city clerk of Buffalo, transmitting a communication from the commissioner of public affairs re tariff on building material; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

SATURDAY, June 10, 1922.

(Legislative day of Thursday, April 20, 1922.)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Borah	Hale	McKinley	Spencer
Brandagee	Harris	McLean	Sterling
Broussard	Harrison	McNary	Sutherland
Cameron	Heflin	Nelson	Swanson
Capper	Johnson	Newberry	Townsend
Culberson	Jones, N. Mex.	Norris	Underwood
Curtis	Jones, Wash.	Oddie	Walsh, Mass.
Dial	Kendrick	Overman	Walsh, Mont.
Dillingham	Keyes	Phipps	Warren
Elkins	King	Polindexter	Watson, Ga.
Ernst	Ladd	Rawson	Watson, Ind.
Fernald	La Follette	Sheppard	Williams
France	Lenroot	Shortridge	Willis
Frelinghuysen	McCormick	Simmons	
Gerry	McCumber	Smoot	

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I wish to state that the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] is absent on account of illness. I ask that this announcement stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

PROHIBITION ENFORCEMENT.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, quite recently the Manufacturers' Record, one of the leading business journals of the country, made a survey of the country to ascertain the value of prohibition and prohibition enforcement. The survey, I think, was quite complete. I have here a digest of the survey. I think, because of the great public interest in the matter, it ought to be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that it be so printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I have no objection to printing anything in the RECORD that is for the information of the public, but in order that we may have an understanding of the weight of the digest, because in digesting an article it may be digested one way or another, I would like to ask who did the digesting?

Mr. STERLING. I am not able to say who did the digesting, but I think it is a fair digest because my attention was called to the original article in the Manufacturers' Record. I think it is a fair digest because it gives exact quotations from the article.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I have no objection to the printing of it except that if we knew who digested the article we might know at what angle the work was built upon.

Mr. STERLING. I am not able to tell the Senator.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROHIBITION DECLARED A SUCCESS BY THE LEADING BUSINESS MEN OF THE NATION.

The Manufacturers' Record, one of the leading business journals of the Nation, recently made a survey of the country to ascertain the value of prohibition. Its effect on the economic, moral, and social life of the Nation is printed in May, 1922.

What the New York Evening Post says of the verdict:

"It is a total fallacy, of course, to suppose that prohibition came suddenly or was in any sense a product of the war. The prohibition movement became influential in the Middle West soon after 1880, quickly invaded the South, and had made 32 States 'dry' when the eighteenth amendment was ratified. Counting local option territory, by 1919 no less than nine-tenths the area and two-thirds the people of the United States were 'dry.' Nor was the movement against the saloon a mere 'moral-uptift' movement. On the contrary, the political motive—dislike of liquor influences—was decided, and the economic motive stronger yet."

"It is this economic element that the letters to the Manufacturers' Record emphasize. 'Unmistakable advantages and relief,' writes a Milwaukee farm-implement maker; 'drunkenness has lessened 100 per cent,' says a Tacoma steel manufacturer; 'the effect on labor and the saving of money have been wonderful,' testifies a Denver banker; 'trouble among employees from liquor has almost disappeared,' declares a Pittsburgh oil man; 'there is nothing which has so helped cotton mills,' says a Birmingham mill owner; and so runs the verdict from a hundred cities."

In a careful compilation of all replies received by the Manufacturers' Record on the prohibition question, the tabulation gives the following remarkable results in percentages to the total:

	Per cent.
For prohibition in some form	98.50
Against prohibition	1.50
For strict prohibition	85.50
For beer and wine	7.00
Against Volstead law or present regulations	1.25

	Per cent.
Wants Volstead law modified.....	.75
Advocates high license or Government control.....	1.00
Advocates dispensary system.....	.25
Undecided or noncommittal.....	2.75

"The most overwhelming answer ever given as to the value of prohibition as an economic and moral factor in advancing the cause of humanity will be found in these letters. With two or three exceptions they all believe in some form of restriction or regulation of the traffic in alcoholic beverages. The effort to break down the prohibition law with wine and beer as the entering wedge is vigorously assailed by educators, business men, and others."

BUSINESS MEN.

Judge E. H. Gary, United States Steel Corporation:

"Yes; results have fully justified prohibition legislation. I endorse the admirable expressions of President Harding on the question."

The expression of President Harding to which Judge Gary refers is as follows:

"In every community men and women have had an opportunity now to know what prohibition means. They know that debts are more promptly paid, that men take home the wages that once were wasted in saloons, that families are better clothed and fed, and more money finds its way into the savings banks. The liquor traffic was destructive of much that was most precious in American life. In the face of so much evidence on that point, what conscientious man would want to let his own selfish desires influence him to vote to bring it back? In another generation I believe that liquor will have disappeared not merely from our politics but from our memories."

Ex-governor and ex-United States Senator, cotton-mill owner, Birmingham, Ala.:

"There is nothing which has so helped cotton mills as the effect of prohibition on the cotton-mill families, and every cotton-mill interest, regardless, should stand by the prohibition laws."

"To repeat, the danger to the eighteenth amendment, to our prohibition laws, to this greatest predicate ever laid for human advancement, is not in the wildcat, the booze flivver, the booze runner, not the man who makes money from whisky selling, but it is in that supposedly higher class of our citizenship who think they can not do without their gin rickey, their cocktail, their 'here's to you,' and the animal exhilaration that comes around the table or in a party when their tongues are loosened, from that class of people who from the very facts in the case will suffer the greatest consequences from this widespread lawlessness which they alone make possible."

Henry M. Leland, president of the Lincoln Motor Co.:

"In Detroit the favorable effects of prohibition are apparent to even a blind man, and this is despite the fact that we have a large population accustomed to drinking liquor. The salvation of our country is assured, because the great mass of common people obey this as other laws because it is the law of the land."

John B. Lennan, retired business man, Bloomington, Ill.:

"Results were excellent and are improving daily."

William S. Witham, organizer of 150 banks, Atlanta, Ga.:

"I find upon investigation that 90 per cent of our people have at last placed 'liquor' in the mad-dog class. Since prohibition came the pay envelope has gone to the wives and children of men who heretofore threw it on the counter of the flannel-mouth liquorite. I have not seen two drunken men where at least fifty before prohibition disgraced our thoroughfares."

C. C. Stoll, oil refiner, Louisville, Ky.:

"Prohibition was good for Kentucky. Even from a business standpoint I think the enthusiasm and impetus for business has been increased. That it has been of decided advantage to the laboring classes must be clear to all observers."

President W. S. Stone, of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Cleveland:

"I find a marked improvement in the number of men who are saving their money and who own their homes or are buying their homes, and I find a decided improvement in the home life of the workers, due to the fact that the women and children have more food, more clothing, and better care in every way. Back of all that, the worker takes his family and goes to the picture show or to the park now, when he formerly spent his evenings in the saloon drinking and spending his money. Drunkenness has decreased at least 75 per cent among the workers."

He further expressed the idea that the "smart set" drinkers are parasites whom liquor is destroying, to the Nation's benefit.

S. S. Kresge, the great 5 and 10 cent store man, of Detroit:

"The result of prohibition is more thrift, bills paid better, homes happier and better provided for."

Manager Sibley, of the Birmingham Clay Products Co., reports that ever since prohibition there has been a steady and marked improvement in the moral, mental, and physical condition of the people, and that from the industrial standpoint alone the employers of Alabama have found prohibition one of their most valuable assets.

J. E. Edgerton, president and general manager of a large woolen mill in Lebanon, Tenn., and president of the National Association of Manufacturers of the United States:

"Thousands of homes have been built which would not have been built and millions of women and children have been provided with food and clothes who would have suffered for these necessities if there were no eighteenth amendment. Except for the absence of the open saloon, these days of reconstruction would be attended by conditions which would make much more difficult the task of rehabilitation."

President E. E. Swift, of National Bank of Auburn, N. Y.:

"There were some sixty-odd saloons in Auburn which were put out of business. Every store which was put out of business has been occupied by some legitimate commercial enterprise, with the exception of a few which are selling soft drinks. Not only this, but rents in the business portion of our city have advanced very rapidly, and owners of the stores formerly used for saloons are getting much more income from these places than ever before, notwithstanding the hard commercial times which we have all passed through during the past year. Notwithstanding a large amount of unemployment in our city, our bank deposits in Auburn have not suffered and the savings deposits have steadily increased."

C. A. Moffett, president Gulf States Steel Co., Birmingham, Ala.:

"Results since prohibition went into effect have shown a wonderful improvement in our employees, a large number of whom are colored people. The efficiency of the labor has been increased to a very large extent and the accidents around our plants have been reduced at least 75 per cent. The improvement has also been shown by a better satis-

fied class of workmen and their families. Numbers of them are buying homes and their families are much better dressed, and the general feeling of contentment among the wives and children is very marked."

A. B. Farquhar, of York, Pa.:

"Prohibition, notwithstanding violation of the law, which is more or less a passing phase, has proved to be of the greatest benefit to the country. The drinking of alcoholic beverages is, next to war, the greatest curse to mankind."

C. W. Galloway, vice president Baltimore & Ohio Railroad:

"The elimination of the corner saloon has without doubt materially improved the whole general situation, and I believe that is generally conceded. It has also been beneficial with respect to the character of work performed, and it can be fairly stated that in that respect much good has been accomplished."

M. M. McCall, president cotton mill, Opelika, Ala.:

"We think prohibition is of untold benefit both to the individual who is practicing it and to those who are dependent on him for support."

George M. Verity, president American Rolling Mills Co., Middletown, Ohio:

"Less lost time, less accidents, less incompetence, less carelessness and inefficiency, better work, better homes, more thrift, happier families, and sober and safer and more efficient men, who now are finding out what it means to really live where they formerly merely existed."

William U. Follansbee, manufacturer, Pittsburgh:

"Experiences have confirmed and strengthened our belief in the great benefits derived from the abolition of the liquor traffic, and we find a steadily increased acknowledgment thereof from all sections and from peoples in all conditions of life, and none are more appreciative of the benefits than those who are ordinarily designated as working people, as influencing the workmen themselves, their families, and their homes."

President E. T. Weir, Weirton Steel Co., N. Y.:

"Prohibition has been beneficial to the great majority of the employees in our mills; they have been more regular in their attendance at work; there have been fewer accidents; their health has been better; and their financial condition has been much improved."

L. N. Bowers, manufacturer, Binghamton, N. Y.:

"In an enterprise in which I was at the head, employing thousands of miners and laborers, the managers took a straw vote in 1921 among the women only, and in one precinct they cast 186 votes and 183 were for 'dry.' In other precincts they voted more than 95 per cent for the continuation of prohibition."

J. J. Phoenix, president Bradley Knitting Mills, Delevan, Wis.:

"As an employer of labor, it has been my province to watch the effects of prohibition upon our twelve to fourteen hundred people, and we find that the laboring man and his family have directly benefited. Better living, better clothing, cleaner and better social life, happier homes with more contentment, better and steadier workers, averaging more efficient and with less sickness and lost time, are some of the benefits to the workers and society in general."

W. H. Reid, steel manufacturer and banker, Tacoma, Wash.:

"Since prohibition became effective, we have not been troubled with a single disturbance on account of liquor in our plant. Drunkenness has been lessened 100 per cent. I would regard the repeal of this law as the greatest calamity that has ever befallen the United States of America."

A. L. Bell, Ridgeway Dynamo & Engine Co., Ridgway, Pa.:

"Those who formerly drank have more money to spend for useful things and for the pleasure of their families. As to the amount of drunkenness in this community, I give you the word of our chief of police that there is now about one-tenth the drunkenness we had with the open saloon."

R. M. Downie, a manufacturer for 40 years, Beaver Falls, Mass.:

"Prohibition was, in a sense, our principal gain from the Great War, and it is worth our present national debt twice over. Among other things it has moved our whole conception of national morals and conscience up to a level never heretofore attained by any other nation, and has cleared the way for permanent industrial prosperity as nothing else could have done."

A. D. Reynolds, Bristol, Tenn.:

"I wish to say in justice to the former dealers of liquor in Bristol they are making good, law-abiding citizens; some of them are conducting some of our leading business houses and are favorably regarded by our people generally. Several of them have joined our leading churches. I don't know of any instance in which they have encouraged violation of the law."

Louis F. Post, Washington, D. C.:

"The information that comes to me casually indicates a highly beneficial effect, that drunkenness—public drunkenness most certainly—is much less common now than it was when the distillery and the brewery interests had their way."

Charles Thaddeus Terry, of New York:

"It has relieved jails and poorhouses, to a very large extent, of their former occupants and resulted in a consequent decrease, as far as those purposes were concerned, in the taxation burdens of the various communities."

R. A. Schofield, a cotton mill man, Danville, Va.:

"The drinking of alcoholic liquor has greatly decreased among the working people, which means that they have increased in efficiency as well as in their living standards, and I can confidently say that the prohibition sentiment is stronger among our people than ever before."

President J. M. Young, of Swets Steel Co., Williamsport, Pa.:

"Anything that has been said in favor of prohibition in days gone by, in my judgment, has been fully confirmed by the experience through which we are now passing."

David N. Lupton, manufacturer, of Philadelphia:

"Never in all history has any law been passed that has benefited mankind so much."

S. F. Bowser, manufacturer, Fort Wayne, Ind.:

"Only one man has lost his job with us on account of drink. We employ from 1,400 to 1,800 people and when the saloons were in operation out of this great number we would have something like the above happen more or less every week or two. Therefore, you see, the improvement has simply been marvelous."

President W. T. Beatty, of the Austin Manufacturing Co., Chicago:

"The present benefits, however, are worth one hundred times all they cost, and I would as soon think of returning to human slavery as of returning to the domination of the distiller, the brewer, and the saloon keeper."

C. E. Hutchinson, manufacturer, Mount Holly, N. C.:

"The practical results of prohibition in our section have been very beneficial from every point of view."

E. J. Lindsay, of Milwaukee:

"The advantage of the act seems to me beyond question. Drunkenness is not as common as before the act became effective, although there is much of it yet."

Arthur K. Baxter, manufacturer, Indianapolis:

"Having to do with the handling of workmen, I can see the wonderful difference now and before prohibition."

President F. N. Briggs, of the Interstate Trust Co., Denver:

"The effect of prohibition on labor and saving of money formerly spent for liquor has been wonderful. Savings deposits have increased more than 33 1/2 per cent throughout the country."

R. H. Scott, Reo Motor Co., Lansing, Mich.:

"Since prohibition went into effect we do not see drunken men on our streets; neither do we hear of drunken men abusing their wives and children."

Charles Yorm, manufacturer, Canton, Ohio:

"On the whole, we are extremely pleased with the results, and we are confident if it was put to a vote of our men in our factory to-day, our factory would vote 'dry' by a large majority."

D. Seltzer, manufacturer, of Bellevue, Ohio:

"From the standpoint of industry alone, we feel that prohibition is more than justifiable, and we will continue to take as strong a stand against liquor as we ever have in the past."

J. C. Haswell, manufacturer, Dayton, Ohio:

"It is the opinion of local financial authorities that a very considerable part of the increase in the savings accounts were due largely to the closing of the saloon, etc."

Edward Freschi, manufacturer, Milwaukee, Wis.:

"I am not a prohibitionist myself, but look upon this matter purely from a scientific and common-sense standpoint. I am convinced that the theory that the country in general would be benefited by prohibition has been proven in fact. I am positive that the benefits greatly overbalance the evils."

W. H. Thomas, manufacturer, Dayton, Ohio:

"There is no question in the world, in my judgment, that the adoption of the eighteenth amendment was one of the greatest pieces of advance legislation that has ever been adopted in our country."

Isaac F. North, president American Soda Fountain Co., Boston:

"Looking at prohibition from a purely economic standpoint, I think that all employers of labor, regardless of their personal opinion, will agree that it has been beneficial both to the workmen and business, but in my estimation the moral effect of it outweighs the economic side and is of vastly more importance to the country at large."

Frederick Fosdick, manufacturer, Boston:

"Comparison of arrests at the present time with arrests before the prohibition act went into effect show conclusively a tremendous advantage under present conditions. We are more than satisfied with the results so far of the law."

W. H. Foster, Youngstown, Ohio:

"The families of the working men are better cared for."

Walter B. Knight, cotton manufacturer, Willimantic, Conn.:

"The use of intoxicants has been greatly curtailed and workmen's houses and families are much better cared for."

E. P. Selden, manufacturer, Erie, Pa.:

"Prohibition has been a great success. Money that was formerly used to buy drink is now used for food and clothing and the betterment of the home."

Mayor James Logan, of Worcester, Mass.:

"Give the prohibition amendment a chance with proper enforcement of the law and in my opinion no man who has the best interests of our country at heart would consider for a moment going back to the old conditions."

J. R. Moore, manufacturer hosiery for years at Forest City, N. C.:

"I consider prohibition one of the greatest blessings to the human race that has come about within a generation."

E. C. Spear, treasurer Cheney Biglow Wire Works, Springfield, Mass.:

"So far as the effects of the Volstead Act on the labor situation is concerned, I believe there has been a very great improvement in the condition of the general run of the laboring men."

Huston Quinn, mayor, Louisville, Ky.:

"Savings accounts show a decided increase, e. g., in July, 1919, they totaled \$18,000,000, to-day \$27,000,000, or an increase of 50 per cent. In 1919, 6,172 persons were arrested for drunkenness, in 1920 the total was 1,053, and the arrests for grand larceny were 478 in 1919 and 313 in 1920."

Aug. W. Smith, president cotton mills, Greenville, S. C.:

"There is no law that has been enacted that has done the good that the prohibition law has. At first I was opposed to the prohibition law, but after seeing the effect on our people I am very much in favor of same."

President A. B. Bryant, of the First National Bank, Gardner, Mass.:

"I am firmly convinced that the Volstead Act has been the greatest step forward, morally and economically, in the history of the country."

Joshua Green, president Puget Sound Navigation Co., Seattle, Wash.:

"I consider prohibition an excellent thing for the entire United States."

Harry B. French, wholesale druggist, Philadelphia:

"Except among the so-called upper class, it seems to me that undoubtedly prohibition has inestimably benefited this country. This is evidenced in increased savings, even in spite of unemployment, increased efficiency, and the larger buying of products for amusement and cultivation."

B. F. Fancher, Fifth Avenue Bank, New York:

"My observation has been that far-reaching and important benefits have already been derived."

Treasurer R. A. Cochran, Maysville Cotton Mills, Maysville, Ky.:

"Before the coming of prohibition we had a saloon within a block of our factory, mainly supported by our employees. The boys are growing up without forming the habit of strong drink."

Treasurer J. P. Reeves, Chicago & Eastern Illinois Railway, Chicago:

"The saloons and central places for drinking are gone, the school for its propagation is shattered, and the habit-forming process reduced. Our American people can only benefit from prohibition."

D. H. Campbell, mining engineer, Iron River, Mich.:

"At our mines for the first nine months after the State of Michigan went dry the number of days of absence from work due to accidents fell off 68 per cent. My conclusions are that conditions are very much better under prohibition than they were under the open saloon."

H. S. Fredenburgh, secretary Gould Manufacturing Co., Seneca Falls, N. Y.:

"We believe that a large volume of savings deposits in this community as well as practically every other community in the United

States, at a time when industrial workers are on short time and many out of employment, is indicative of the disposition on the part of these men to save money which was formerly spent for liquor, etc."

Vice President H. W. Coffin, the Alabama (Iron) Co., Birmingham, Ala.:

"Prohibition has been of great benefit to all employers of labor."

President Newton Doremus, Land & Loan Co., Red Bank, N. J.:

"There is a great satisfaction in the fact that the eighteenth amendment has resulted in thousands more of happy homes and a better day for women and children, as shown by the increased attendance in our schools and the higher standard of living enjoyed by them."

C. W. Malsland, rugs and carpets, Philadelphia:

"The ability of the working people to sustain themselves during the extended depression, such as we have had the last 18 months, is very largely due to prohibitory laws. Drunkenness is decidedly uncommon. We have one man in our employ who occasionally comes under the influence of liquor where we previously had fifty."

President Clarence H. Kelsey, Title Guarantee & Trust Co., New York:

"I believe with President Harding, as reported in this morning's papers."

President E. B. Thornton, Bedford Steam Stone Works, Bedford, Ind.:

"Our jail here now has no inmates, while it was full to overflowing when we had saloons. A drunken man in our city is never seen any more."

Asa G. Candler, banker, Atlanta, Ga.:

"None but one who is blind, deaf, and dumb can dispute the statement that prohibition in this or any other community has greatly benefited employers and employees."

President E. O. Gass, Scoville Manufacturing Co., Waterbury, Conn.:

"My experience is that our workmen are, almost without exception, in better condition both to render normal, efficient service and to resist disease. Their family life is better stabilized."

President Wm. J. Montgomery, Eighth National Bank, Philadelphia:

"Savings deposits in the bank with which I am connected are to-day the largest in its history, and I believe this to be the general rule. A man to-day under the influence of liquor is a very conspicuous person, and folks turn about and wonder where he got it. Before prohibition no attention was paid to such a person."

D. D. Bowsher, merchant, South Bend, Ind.:

"Merchants, business and professional men throughout the city, when they are taxed right down to give a careful opinion, is that business is better, collections are better, and the living conditions of hundreds of families are very much better."

Geo. F. Cotterill, ex-mayor, Seattle, Wash.:

"There has been and is manifest on every hand abundant evidence of the beneficial effects of prohibition upon labor conditions, savings, betterment of homes, and better care of women and children dependent upon men who formerly spent freely for drink. Prohibition is at least 95 per cent efficient and will go on to 100 per cent with steadfast and determined law enforcement throughout America."

President T. J. Gillespie, Lockhart Iron & Steel Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.:

"Labor is more efficient. Men are saving their money and buying homes and supplying the needs of their families as never before."

Charles W. Garfield, banker, Grand Rapids, Mich.:

"We have innumerable instances in our city of the beneficial results of eliminating the saloons—in the promotion of thrift, better housing, improved domestic conditions, and happier women and children."

C. Edwin Michael, president Virginia Bridge & Iron Co., Roanoke, Va.:

"Prohibition, if reasonably enforced, is a great blessing to our people."

L. M. Bowers, retired (formerly employing many thousands of men), Binghamton, N. Y.:

"The home has wonderfully benefited, especially among the foreign laboring men; wife beating and brawls reduced almost to zero among that class."

William A. Schalpur, manufacturer, Minneapolis, Minn.:

"The crime wave now sweeping the whole world has no connection with liquor. It is the aftermath of the war and affects all nations."

Ev-Gov. Samuel R. Van Sant, Minneapolis, Minn.:

"Savings-bank deposits show that the laboring people are now saving their money; their children are better fed and clothed and being better educated."

General Superintendent Lawrence, managing five large iron-ore properties in Michigan, says:

"The liquor traffic was a brake on the wheels of progress and like a millstone on the neck of our civilization." And adds that he "has optimism enough to believe that another generation will know but little of the evils of the liquor traffic."

PROFESSIONAL, SOCIAL, AND OTHER LEADING AMERICANS.

Raymond Robins, social worker and economist, Chicago:

"Prohibition has greatly increased the comfort, food supply, savings, and general well-being of the working people of the United States. Money formerly spent for liquor goes for food, clothes, books, the movies, and savings. Every mother can tell you the difference in the increased resources and comfort of the home. Prohibition is one of the oldest subjects of discussion and agitation in American politics. Two-thirds of the States voted dry by popular referendum before the passage of the prohibition amendment to the Constitution. More than two-thirds of each House of Congress voted to submit the amendment. Forty-six States have ratified this amendment. New Jersey came in the other day with a ratification delay of over two years. It was supposed to be the wettest territory in the United States. No political party dares to support repeal of the Volstead Act, much less the amendment. There will be several years of battle to finally break the back of the whisky ring, and then the liquor traffic will be as extinct as the dodo."

Dr. Harvey W. Wiley:

"I think beer is probably the most dangerous to health of all the pure ordinary alcoholic liquors. The bootlegging industry will gradually kill itself by killing off all its patrons. From the viewpoint of public health prohibition has been a wonder worker. I am not a believer in the use of distilled spirits as a remedy. Alcohol is never a stimulant but always a narcotic. My belief is that the death rate in such diseases as pneumonia and influenza is much higher where alcohol is used as an internal remedy than where it is not. Long since the medical profession has ceased to regard alcohol in some of its beverage forms as a remedy for tuberculosis, and it is now practically the universal belief that it is, on the other hand, an aid to speedy dissolution."

Dr. Emory S. Bogardus, Los Angeles:

"Has turned millions of dollars into more productive channels. Apparently one-tenth to one-third as much drunkenness now, dependent upon class of people concerned. The chief change has been the transfer of energy and money from destructive or low producing levels to higher levels."

Ex-Gov. Hugh M. Dorsey, of Georgia:

"Much of the money formerly spent for whisky is now being devoted to the support and education of families and the improvement of home conditions. Drunkenness is by no means as common at the present time as under the open saloon and free liquor-traffic program."

H. S. Dulaney, of Baltimore:

"I am quite sure that the effect of prohibition on the laboring man can not be anything but for his betterment. Drunkenness is not nearly so common as it was under the licensed liquor traffic."

Congressman S. D. Fess:

"Recent surveys made by those unfriendly to prohibition prove that it is a success. The first article of the New York Herald survey admitted that there was a decrease in the consumption of beverage liquor under the eighteenth amendment of 70 per cent. Another survey made through the Cosmopolitan Magazine states that the number of drinkers of intoxicants has decreased from about 20,000,000 under the license system to 2,500,000 under national prohibition. A policy of Government that makes such a showing is not a failure but a success. When prohibition is universally enforced and observed the results will be proportionately greater."

Dr. H. E. Robinson, professor pathology, University of Minnesota:

"That the people who have no self-control or knowledge enough to stay away from harmful stimulants should not be forcefully protected from their own indulgence is a monstrous proposition. We attempt to guard carefully other poisons with the approval of practically the entire body politic. I, for one, am perfectly willing to forego the use of this particular poison for the benefit of the entire race. I am particularly concerned with the effects of alcohol on the descendants of confirmed alcoholics and on the economic welfare of their families. So far as my limited experience can observe, economic conditions amongst the laboring classes are distinctly improved as a result of enforced prohibition. Drunkenness is certainly not as common at the present time as in the past, and while death and serious disabling diseases are quite often seen from drinking improperly prepared alcoholic stimulants, cases of acute alcoholism such as were so common in preprohibition days are practically abolished, except in the very large cities where enforcement of the law has been particularly lax."

Lewis Jerome Johnson, professor civil engineering, Harvard University:

"I believe that the mass of voters and their representatives now realize from their own experience that the liquor business can be granted no place in a would-be orderly society."

Dr. A. M. Barrett, director Psychopathic Hospital, University of Michigan:

"Those who are interested in the care and treatment of mental disorders have uniformly found a marked decrease of disorders due to alcohol during the last few years. To my personal knowledge wards formerly used for the care of alcoholic patients are now used for other purposes. There has been a great falling off in the admission of alcoholic mental disorders to the hospitals for the insane in this country. This fact alone is strong evidence of the benefits brought about by prohibition."

Frank M. Thompson, attorney general, Nashville:

"It has been my observation and I am dealing with the question constantly, that the exclusion of liquor and all intoxicating beverages by law has been a very great advantage to the laboring classes, as well as the manufacturing class."

Lawrence F. Abbott, president Outlook, New York:

"I think it is more than probable that 25 years from now the average American man or woman will no more think of taking alcohol habitually than they now think of taking opium habitually. If this state of things can be brought about in our civilization, it will be an enormous gain for social, moral, and efficient standards of life."

Mary Antin, author and lecturer, Wellesley, Mass.:

"The difficulties that have been encountered in enforcing the prohibition law are in my mind no argument whatever in favor of restoration of the liquor traffic. It was very difficult at one time to clear the seas of pirates, and yet that was not taken as an argument in favor of permitting piracy to endure. All the pains of readjustment that this generation may be subjected to will be but a small price to pay for the inestimable blessing of a world that shall have forgotten it was once under the sway of the drink evil."

Dr. Richard C. Cabot, Boston:

"I favor prohibition as strongly as I ever did, and I am certain that its good results are manifest in Massachusetts, despite the fact that we have as yet no local enforcement law."

Dr. Haven Emerson, former commissioner of health, New York:

"Nothing since the application of modern bacteriology to the control of communicable diseases will have so powerful an effect in reducing the incidence of disease and the general death rate as prohibition."

S. S. McClure, editor of McClure's Magazine:

"The results are favorable to prohibition. Our laws are inadequately enforced in all fields. We do as well in enforcing prohibition as the law against murder."

Ex-president of the University of Minnesota, Dr. Cyrus Northrup:

"There is less drunkenness and less drinking than formerly. More working men have deposits in savings banks. Families are better cared for."

Editor James Schermerhorn, Detroit, Mich.:

"What has been saved and conserved of health, wealth, and fireside content, comprises a more sensational story than anything ever printed about bootlegging. I go about a great deal and seldom see that most offensive of all sights—a besotted American, once an ever-present nuisance. The public drunk has vanished."

Attorney William S. U'Ren, Portland, Oreg.:

"It is impossible to estimate the benefit that prohibition has conferred on the wives and children of all the habitual drinkers, except those who are rich enough to think they can violate the law with impunity. There is not one drunk in Oregon now where there used to be one hundred in the days of the open saloon."

W. A. White, editor Emporia (Kans.) Gazette:

"I am glad to say that prohibition is succeeding in my part of the country."

Mrs. Mary E. Walley, president of the Mount Holyoke College, of South Hadley, Mass.:

"That the betterment of homes and better care of women and children of the men who formerly spent freely for drink are marked."

Editor Richard Lloyd Jones, of the Tulsa Tribune:

"Prohibition has put the country ahead financially and morally and increased efficiency. Credit has improved. Drunkenness is uncommon."

The superintendent of Battle Creek Sanatorium, Dr. J. Harvey Kellogg:

"Prohibition in the highest degree promotes human welfare and business prosperity. Drunkenness is now exceedingly rare, whereas formerly it was very common."

Amos P. Wilder, of the New Haven Journal Courier:

"We have seen the impossible come to pass in our time. One goes to a banquet of perhaps a thousand men and sees them spend hours without alcoholic beverages where five years ago each 'cover' was circled with glasses—spend hours without even mentioning alcohol."

Dr. Rockwell H. Hunt, director of the College of Commerce of the University of Southern California:

"In spite of exhibitions of lawlessness here and there, the beneficent effects of prohibition are being felt more and more. Literally millions of persons have quietly given up drink altogether, thus adding to their happiness and prosperity."

Ellen Hayes, retired professor, Wellesley College:

"Prohibition can already show a record of actual and far-reaching benefit."

President E. J. Stockpale, of the Harrisburg Telegraph:

"Drunkenness is not so common, and while there are unfortunate developments which are attributed to prohibition, these are frequently magnified for propaganda purposes and should not be taken too seriously in any consideration of the subject."

Editor George F. Milton, Chattanooga News, Chattanooga, Tenn.:

"I have noted a very marked improvement wherever I have been as to sobriety, industry, and better citizenship. I have seen the effects of liquor on the mountain whites, whose feuds and assassinations are increased in number by it. I have seen its effects in stirring the most bestial passions of the Negro, thus making the race problem more difficult of solution. With no liquor sold, it is hardly worth speaking of as a problem."

Dr. Eugene Lyman Fisk, medical director, Life Extension Institute (Inc.), New York:

"It is evident that there is more money being spent on the homes and savings are increasing. It is my opinion that we will see an improvement in the conditions as time goes on, as the old toppers die off."

Dr. Henry King, President Oberlin College:

"The essential reasons for the policy seem to me still to be practically just what they were when the prohibition of the liquor traffic was up for vote. I have not been able to test from personal observation to any particular extent the comparative success of the enforcement of the law, but I expected that there would be difficulties at that point for some time."

Robert McMurdy, attorney, Chicago:

"My opposition to the liquor traffic has always been largely because of its demoralizing influence upon women. Prohibition has very greatly lessened this evil."

L. F. Hollis, social service and educational director for Victor Monaghan Co., Greenville, S. C.:

"There is no question as to the benefits of prohibition to the workers in our industries. In the South we have noted a wonderful change for the better along all lines of educational and church work, and the operatives are much more steady and of a higher type of character."

Attorney Preston A. Vaught, Mount Carmel, Pa.:

"The eighteenth amendment represents the greatest forward step in this generation and that historians will use it as a marker for a new epoch in the Nation's history."

J. Hammond Smith, School of Engineering, Pittsburgh:

"The enactment of our prohibition laws marked one of the greatest advances in the civilization that the world has ever experienced. The enforcement of these laws is the supreme test of the fundamental principles of our democracy."

Courtney Guild, Commercial Bulletin, Boston:

"The only disappointment in national prohibition has been the disappointment of those who wished to see it become a flat failure."

President Frank L. McVey, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Ky.:

"In this community prohibition has had a marked effect in bettering the situation economically and morally."

Ex-Congressman A. M. Todd, Kalamazoo, Mich.:

"I intend to do everything I can to maintain the present prohibition law, which I consider the most important act of legislation in America for the present century."

Dr. E. V. McCollum, professor chemical hygiene, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore:

"The passage of the eighteenth amendment marks the beginning of a new era in American history."

Charles E. Davenport, Carnegie Institute:

"That prohibition has been, despite all difficulties, somewhat effective is shown by the marked decrease in the number of alcoholics in institutions for the insane, the inebriate asylums, and the emergency hospitals, like Bellevue, New York."

Dr. James C. Egbert, Columbia University:

"Tremendous progress has been made in interfering with the unfortunate use of alcohol and that homes are maintained, women and children are cared for in a way of which we had no conception before the passing of the prohibition amendment."

United States District Judge Thomas J. Chatfield, Brooklyn, N. Y.:

"Prohibition has had a good effect upon labor, has caused the saving of much money which formerly was spent in saloons and for liquor, and that the wives and children of the men who formerly spent money for drink have in most instances benefited from the effects of prohibition. Drunkenness is far less prevalent than previously, but the few public cases of drunkenness receive much greater attention and advertisement than formerly."

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER, of Kansas:

"I think the law is measuring up to the expectations of its friends. Our people have observed its operation first-hand for nearly half a century, and to-day I believe it is entirely conservative to say that fully 95 per cent of them look upon the prohibitory law as one of the greatest blessings ever bestowed upon the State by legislative enactment."

Dr. A. N. Halcomb, Harvard University:

"It has improved the conditions of home life. Particularly the conditions of life for women and children in homes where the money was formerly spent for drink. In this part of the country drunkenness is less frequent than before prohibition and crimes resulting from intoxication have greatly diminished."

Dr. Charles A. Peck, University of Tennessee, Knoxville:

"There is no comparison between the public drunkenness of the days before prohibition and that at the present time. This is naturally a moonshine district, but so far as I have heard the sentiment of the better class of citizens is in favor of more stringency rather than in favor of relaxing the enforcement of the prohibition laws."

President William Goodell Frost, Berea College, Berea, Ky.:

"The abolition of the liquor traffic is by far the most important forward step taken in our generation. The immediate results for good are much greater than I expected."

Dr. E. E. Montgomery, Philadelphia:

"No longer is it necessary to maintain wards in hospitals for the treatment of the victims of alcohol and those who walk the streets are impressed with the infrequency of drunken men."

President Frank B. Trotter, West Virginia University, Morgantown, W. Va.:

"The benefits of prohibition are seen on every side, and with 1,800 students under my paternal care I find that the discipline now with that number is not nearly so difficult as it was six years ago with 600."

President W. D. Weatherford, Southern College of Young Men's Christian Association, Nashville, Tenn.:

"I do not think I have seen a dozen in the city of Nashville since the national prohibition law went into effect."

Col. L. M. Mans (retired), Rockville, Md.:

"In my opinion drunkenness has decreased throughout every class of society."

Frederic Almy (retired social worker), Buffalo, N. Y.:

"Already savings banks, hospitals, police courts, and charitable agencies show notable changes, and, economically, wet countries will find it difficult to compete with a dry one."

J. E. W. Wallin, director Bureau of Special Education, Oxford, Ohio:

"An enormous amount of good has resulted thus far, but I am convinced that we can not adequately estimate all the influences of prohibition in less than 50 or 100 years."

Executive Secretary Walter S. McLaren, Institute of Politics, Williamstown, Mass.:

"The results of the measure have more than justified my belief that it would bring about an economic, social, and intellectual improvement in all our communities."

A. J. Wurts, professor of research, Carnegie Institute of Technology, Pittsburgh:

"Last summer I saw in the war-stricken towns and cities of Europe men and women of the middle and poorer classes sitting at tables on the sidewalks drinking beer and other liquors. They were spending their money on drink and then asking us for help, and I think we have been the more able to help because of prohibition."

Robert Fletcher, director emeritus Thayer School of Engineering, Dartmouth College:

"Why argue their question forever? We do not argue about murder, adultery, theft, and other crimes. The liquor traffic eventually involves all of these. It has ever been defiant of the laws."

The above quotations are characteristic from the hundreds of statements which were published. This testimony, gathered together by this great business journal, is a convincing document to prove that the eighteenth amendment and laws enacted pursuant thereto are accomplishing splendid results.

WHITE HOUSE POLICE FORCE.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, on yesterday I entered a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill (S. 3659) to create the White House police force, and for other purposes, was passed by the Senate. I am opposed to the bill. I do not think it is necessary, and furthermore I do not like the idea, at least by legislation, of making the President the chief of a police squad in the District of Columbia or anywhere else. However, I am not going to detain the bill here by the motion. It will have to pass the scrutiny of another body of the Congress and I feel that if it should pass that body too, I would be willing to give way in my judgment. I am in hopes that it will not pass the House. Therefore, I shall withdraw my motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill passed the Senate and let the bill take its course in the House.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I am through.

Mr. KING. Let me ask for information, does the bill take the control of the White House police entirely away from the District Commissioners?

Mr. JONES of Washington. It does. It makes the President the superintendent and head of that force.

Mr. KING. I am opposed to the bill, too.

Mr. JONES of Washington. It creates a separate police organization in the District of Columbia under the President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the motion to reconsider will be withdrawn.

GOV. W. P. G. HARDING, FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have read some brief extracts from an editorial in the Manufacturers' Record on the reappointment of the present governor of the Federal Reserve Board.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The reading clerk read as follows:

THE NATION-WIDE PROPAGANDA TO SECURE RENOMINATION OF GOVERNOR HARDING TO FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD ENDANGERS THE SAFETY OF OUR BANKING INTERESTS.

"Business men throughout the country are being solicited by mail to write to the President and to Members of Congress and bring what pressure they can to bear in the interest of the

reappointment to office of Gov. W. P. G. Harding, of the Federal Reserve Board. The campaign to create an artificial and untrue impression of a public demand for the retention of this official does not end there. It raises itself, in one form or another, at every convention of bankers, and even at commercial conventions, wherever they may meet. It generally takes the form of a resolution of indorsement and is presented in such a way and at such a time that earnest antagonism to it can not be organized. Moreover, bankers, and business men fear in many cases to speak boldly out in meeting, so great is the menace of later coercion.

"It is contended that the Federal reserve system and honest money are being attacked and that the preservation of neither is possible unless Governor Harding is retained in office. The campaign to keep him in his seat is obviously well financed, we do not know by whom. But we imagine that the reserve banks could easily do this and charge to their expense account, on which we think there is no check except the conscience of their officers.

"In the long history of human blundering, recorded and unrecorded, students will search in vain to find the record of a high financial official who, in any country, in any century, by any test, equaled in the profundity of its disastrous consequences the record of Governor Harding. He is not only indicted by the dead and bankrupt of his own country, but the paralysis of trade the world over, which has doomed millions to anguish, may be laid in large measure, and has so been laid by great economists, to the policies that forever will be identified with the Governor Harding stewardship.

"Time takes the measure of all humans. They can not escape its just and irrevocable verdict. It writes its judgments with the ink of fact on the parchment of current events, where all who have eyes to see can read, and being written so the record stands forever and forever. It is not within the power of the President by a reappointment, or of Bourbonistic financiers through propaganda, to blot out the indelible verdict. There is no authority under the sun that can make the sun stand still, there is no human hand that can hold back the tides, and there is no human brain, no human conspiracy, so subtle and so cute as to confuse the fundamental truth and wipe out from the record of Governor Harding the spots that are all over it. His incompetency has been overmastering. His conspicuous inabilities condemn him to future obscurity, not to further honors.

"Employed because he was supposed to be a financier, admittedly in the first great test of reconstructive finance he misconceived, misjudged, inaccurately and inadequately assessed the situation and permitted a condition to exist and grow worse which, the board has since admitted, ought surely to have been retarded. But moderation Governor Harding knows nothing about. He is an extremist. The greatest of inflationists, he became the greatest of deflationists.

"He knew no more than that cotton was bringing more than it used to bring when he banked in Birmingham. 'Our present task,' said a bulletin of the Richmond Reserve Bank, which is subservient to Governor Harding, 'is to proceed with the deflation of credits as rapidly and as systematically as possible.'

"But Congress in its wisdom had set up an agency to prevent just the catastrophe which Governor Harding had decided to bring about. The War Finance Corporation was in operation, and a debacle in prices could not be engineered in its entirety by the Federal reserve system if the corporation continued to function. Accordingly Governor Harding's alter ego, Secretary Houston, we believe illegally and we know disastrously, unceremoniously kicked the corporation and an act of Congress out of the back door at one and the same time. The directors of the corporation, some of them unwilling and coerced by Secretary Houston, on May 10, 1920, adopted this resolution:

"Resolved, That at the request of the Secretary of the Treasury and pending further action by this board, the making by the corporation of further advances for export purposes, except pursuant to existing commitments, be suspended."

"So sank the knife into the bowels of agriculture and national prosperity. Here was the Governor Harding policy out in the open, and it was a policy of death.

"We need not recount here the general cataclysm that resulted. We can not even discuss how it was that the great producing elements were kept in ignorance of the attack about to be made on them while certain better-informed financial interests made ready for the rainy day. Let readers look back for themselves to the newspaper statements made by Governor Harding when he went to New York in the memorable days of November, 1919, and compare them with his subsequent opposite

policy. Some men have thought that he was a victim lured into the trap.

"Nor can we here dwell on the multitude of incidents which in the aggregate made clear the Governor Harding policy and showed, as if pictured in the skies, the enormity of his economic blundering. Our purpose is rather to show how later events have completely demonstrated his incompetency.

"Liberty bonds were down in the eighties. Credit was almost not to be had. Commodity prices had dropped until all agriculture was panic-stricken. The mother herds were being killed on the plains. The South was planting what was destined to be one of the smallest crops of cotton in recent years. Bankruptcies were habitual. Not in a century had the people of the Nation been so low in funds, so low in spirit, so desperate, so hopeless. Hundreds of banks were being kept open only by subterfuge. Secret creditors' committees were likewise struggling to keep great corporations alive.

"Economic conditions were not strangling the world, bad as they were. The world, in fact, was in grave need. It could have consumed more than America could have produced. The strangulation was artificial. It was arbitrary policy that was strangling prosperity. It was artificial policy that was costing this Nation more than the war itself had cost. It was incompetence that had the United States by the throat—colossal incompetence.

"We say in all sincerity that there is no basic condition today warranting better times and better feeling now than there was in the period of greatest depression except this one thing—financial policy. The sources of credit had been dammed up by Governor Harding.

"Do not the times, in unanimous accord, cry out that the Jonah of finance be permitted to retire into private life?

"Who prostituted the national honor and put it in the position of repudiating its pledges in regard to Liberty bonds? Who poured filth on their integrity and drove them out of banks?

"Who practiced usury and utilized the infamous graduated interest rate to ruin country banks?

"Who, according to the Supreme Court of the United States, waged war illegally on State banks?

"Who permitted great bank palaces to be erected out of enormous profits taken from stricken industry?

"Who brought the Federal reserve system into disrepute and made necessary a fight by all good men and true against its manifold exactions?

"Between the economic concepts of Governor Harding and men such as President Harding and Secretary Mellon there is a great gulf. The former stands for hard times. He is the doctrine of cheapness. The snarl of whips on sweating backs for profit's sake, a cheap race ground down for cheap production, a belief that only from the poverty of others can a few gain riches and ease—somehow, so do we conceive the Governor Harding concept of fundamentally good conditions.

"It is, therefore, almost in the nature of an insult for any set of men, be they financiers or not, to ask that President Harding retain in office a man who in his elements is so utterly out of tune with everything that the President himself stands for and believes. The horsemen of the night do not work all in the day. Nor is it fair, on other grounds, that President Harding should harness his administration to a liability of such ponderous size as Governor Harding. In America, justly, it is not the custom to reward failure. Our laurels go to those who have earned them.

"* * * The way to save the valuable features of the Federal reserve system is not to retain in office the one man who more than all others is responsible for the disrepute into which the system fell. That would be but to nurse discontent and to force the whole banking question into a political campaign. If it ever gets there, there can be but one answer. In votes the banking element is not formidable. Only a fool would willingly toss a great technical question of this sort into the political arena. The way to save what is good in the system is to get what is bad out of the system. And the worst thing in the system, recent events have shown, is the governor of it. He has been the trouble maker and disaster's chief henchman."

Mr. McCUMBER and Mr. HEFLIN addressed the Chair.
The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Dakota.
Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President—

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield to the Senator from Alabama. I see he was on his feet.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Alabama is recognized.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, the writer of the editorial which has just been read at the desk is one of the ablest and cleanest Americans beneath the flag. He has devoted his whole life to the public interest, and has worked in season and out for the building up of the South and the West, and, in fact, the whole country, industrially, commercially, and agriculturally. Richard H. Edmonds is the fearless, able editor who pens this indictment against Governor Harding of the Federal Reserve Board. The country is under lasting obligation to Mr. Edmonds for the fight which he has made in exposing and condemning the disastrous and the deadly deflation policy of the Federal Reserve Board.

I wanted the editorial read to-day in the hearing of the press representatives, and I wanted Senators to hear the editorial read, for I want the country to be put upon notice that an organized effort is on foot by the forces of Wall Street, which profited by the distress of the South and the West. They made their millions out of the deflation policy of Governor Harding and they want to bring about his reappointment. I want the country to know that the same robber gang that used the Governor of the Federal Reserve Board to the detriment and injury of millions of American people have now the boldness and the effrontery to seek to have this man reappointed and are moving heaven and earth to that end. I want the people to know, Mr. President, what is going on here. Those back of the propaganda have already sent out the impression through the press that he is going to be reappointed. That is for the purpose of intimidating bankers; that is for the purpose of inducing them to court favor with Governor Harding. Many of the little bankers who have been choked practically to death by this deflation policy now are afraid to fight the reappointment of this man. They do not want him appointed. But the effort is made to make them think that he is going to be reappointed.

Mr. President, if the rank and file of the honest bankers of America could record their honest convictions to-day they would enter a protest against the reappointment of this man, but this other gang is using its power and working hard to overwhelm President Harding with the idea that the business interests of the country want this man reappointed. We shall see who has the ear of the President in this appointment—whether 75 or 80 millions of Americans who have been stricken down and robbed by the deflation policy or whether those who struck them down and robbed them will have his ear.

Governor Harding hails from my State, but I shall fight to the last his confirmation. From every standpoint he is an unfit man for this place. I am convinced that he is the handy instrument and subservient tool of Wall Street. I would not say that if I were not honestly convinced of the fact; but being convinced that he is such a tool, I will not sit silent in my place in this Chamber and permit the control of the greatest banking system ever devised to be again submitted to the manipulation, perversion, and trickery of the man who has served the interests of those who, like greedy vampires, have sucked the lifeblood from the body of American business.

Mr. President, the Washington Times of yesterday had a little notice to this effect:

Despite rumors to the contrary, W. P. G. Harding is expected to be reappointed to his position as Governor of the Federal Reserve Board.

If he is named the country will have some startling revelations made to it, not in executive session. I am going to speak in the open, on the floor of the Senate, and I want the country to know the names of the Senators from the South and West and elsewhere who vote to confirm this man. I do not believe the President is going to reappoint him. I have reasons for believing that he is not going to reappoint him, and I will state those reasons if his name ever comes upon this floor.

I simply wanted to say this much now, Mr. President, that the country may know what is going on. I have never witnessed anything like it—a man whose policy is condemned by every honest banker in the country and every honest business man who knows the facts. I am not talking about those who profited by his pillage and plunder, those who have grown fat by reason of his policies. Of course they want to keep him in, because he is their agent. No man under the sun has served them so well, or would serve them so well in the future. Of course they want to keep him in; but what of the power that must safeguard the interests of the American people? It is unthinkable that the President would even consider reappointing this man to such a responsible position.

Why, Mr. President, they have gone in this propaganda to the extent of saying that I and some others who fought this man's policies are opposed to the Federal reserve banking system. When they say that they know that they tell that which is not true.

I have never opposed the system. I have never criticized it. On the other hand, I have praised it. I praise it now as the greatest banking system ever devised. A State banker asked me not long ago if I would go into it if I were in his place. I said, "Well, you must decide that for yourself. Under different management I think I would go into it. I think it is the greatest system in the world. It has been maladministered. It has a fellow at the head of it now who has administered it in the interest of a favored few to the hurt and injury of the many." He said, "Well, if they have a new head of this board and get a new start, I believe I will go in."

Mr. President, I stated on the floor of the Senate that bankers have written to me and other Senators have told me that bankers have written to them, saying, "Don't use my name, but this is being done, and that was done, by the Federal Reserve Board. If you use my name, I will be punished in so many ways, so please don't mention by name." Now, the President of the United States, Chief Magistrate of a hundred millions of people, is being asked to reappoint this man that honest bankers are afraid of and that Wall Street demands shall be reappointed. I want the country to know what is going on—that they are moving heaven and earth to try to get him reappointed, and I am hoping and praying that the President of the United States will not even consider seriously the reappointment of this man.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial I had read may be printed in 8-point type.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

THE TARIFF.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7456) to provide revenue, to regulate commerce with foreign countries, to encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I ask now to return to paragraph 358, page 75.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment of the committee will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. The committee proposes, after the numerals of the paragraph 358, to strike out all down to and including the words "provided further" and the comma on line 24, and to insert the following words:

Safety razors, and safety-razor handles and frames, 20 cents each and 30 per cent ad valorem; razors and parts thereof, finished or unfinished, valued at less than \$1.50 per dozen, 30 cents each; valued at \$1.50 and less than \$3 per dozen, 35 cents each; valued at \$3 and less than \$4 per dozen, 40 cents each; valued at \$4 or more per dozen, 50 cents each; and in addition thereto, on all of the foregoing, 60 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. McCUMBER. On line 25, on behalf of the committee, I move to strike out "20 cents each" and insert in lieu thereof "10 cents each."

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. In the committee amendment, on line 25, it is proposed to strike out "20" and insert "10."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has a right to modify the committee amendment.

Mr. McCUMBER. Now, Mr. President, I want to make just one general statement of explanation upon these razors. The committee struck out all of paragraph 358, as reported from the House, and the paragraph will now read, as I propose to amend it:

Safety razors, and safety-razor handles and frames, 10 cents each and 30 per cent ad valorem; razors and parts thereof, finished or unfinished, valued at less than 75 cents per dozen, 20 cents each; valued at 75 cents and less than \$1.50 a dozen, 30 cents each; valued at \$1.50 and less than \$3 per dozen, 35 cents each; valued at \$3 and less than \$4 per dozen, 40 cents each; valued at \$4 or more per dozen, 50 cents each; and in addition thereto, on all of the foregoing, 50 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. President, prior to the war there were being imported into this country an immense quantity of very cheap razors that were made for sale, not for shaving. Here [exhibiting] is an example of one of the razors that came into the country and were used mostly by those stores which advertised that for a given number of coupons upon purchases at that particular store there would be presented to the purchaser a razor. It is rather a nice-looking instrument to the view, but it was never intended to shave, and never would shave anything. It is an absolutely worthless thing; and if we could have a high enough duty to exclude it entirely I think it would be a benefit to the American purchaser. It is not even fit for corns. It

would not shave anything more than the first attempt. It is made out of Bessemer steel, which is all right to make steel rails, but is absolutely unfit as a steel from which to make razors. It may be that the duties which we propose are somewhat high upon those razors that ought to be excluded entirely.

I desire to insert here a table, which I will mark "Table No. 1."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The table is as follows:

TABLE NO. 1.—Razors.

Importer's No.	Selling price of imported article, United States.	Profit and overhead.	Landed cost.	Domestic selling price.	Domestic No.	Spread.
		Per cent.				Percent.
504.....	\$23.80	182	\$5.62	\$16.89	1-444	200
3007.....	10.00	36	4.82	13.30	0-434	176
1150.....	12.00	117	3.63	13.30	2-434	267
B100.....	21.00	86.5	7.51	17.05	0-644	127
101.....	21.00	86.5	7.51	17.05	0-644	127
10.....	23.52	250	4.74	18.20	9-444	284
1352.....	10.00	74	3.77	14.80	56-634	292
Average.....			5.37	15.80		194

The spread between the landed cost (not including duty) of the imported razors and the selling prices of the domestic razors, as shown in the above table, ranges from 127 to 292 per cent, or an average of 194 per cent for all of the items.

Mr. McCUMBER. The table shows the importer's number, the selling price of the imported article in the United States, the profit and overhead of the importer, the landed cost, the domestic selling price, the domestic number, and the spread between the domestic selling price and the landed cost.

Taking the first item, which is No. 504, the selling price of the imported article in the United States was \$23.80 per dozen, the profit and overhead is 182 per cent, the landed cost is \$5.62, the domestic selling price is \$16.89, the spread is 200 per cent.

In the case of the next number, the selling price of the imported article in the United States is \$10 per dozen, the profit and overhead is 36 per cent, the landed cost of that article is \$4.82, the domestic selling price is \$13.30. That leaves a spread of 176 per cent.

I will not quote any further, but will simply say that the spread ranges from 127 per cent to 292 per cent.

I have here another table, which I will insert in the RECORD, which shows the German import and the English import prices, applying the rates which the committee have finally agreed upon. I ask to have this table inserted in the RECORD at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The table is as follows:

TABLE NO. 2.

The following table includes the average prices of the items in Table No. 1, grouped according to the rates of duty:

Germany, over \$3 and under \$4.	Germany, over \$4 a dozen.	English, over \$4 a dozen.
40 cents each and 50 per cent. Foreign value..... \$3.53 Landing charges..... .18 Specific..... 4.80 Ad valorem..... 1.77	50 cents each and 50 per cent. Foreign value..... \$5.94 Landing charges..... .51 Specific..... 6.00 Ad valorem..... 2.97	50 cents each and 50 per cent. Foreign value..... \$5.94 Landing charges..... .51 Specific..... 6.00 Ad valorem..... 2.30
Plus 20 per cent..... 10.28 2.30	Plus 20 per cent..... 15.42 3.08	Plus 20 per cent..... 13.12 2.62
12.58	18.50	15.74
Price of domestic razor, \$14.05 per dozen.	Price of domestic razor, \$17.30 per dozen.	Price of domestic razor, \$13.30 per dozen.

Plus 20 per cent is for importers' overhead expenses and profit.

Mr. McCUMBER. Taking those imported from Germany at more than \$3 and less than \$4, the duty on which is 40 cents each and 50 per cent ad valorem, the foreign value is \$3.53, the landing cost is 18 cents, the specific duty would amount to \$4.80, and the ad valorem duty would amount to \$1.77. That would make a landed cost, without overhead or profit, of \$10.28. Plus 20 per cent, which we have allowed for overhead and profit, or \$2.30, it would give those razors a selling price in the American market of \$12.58. The selling price of the comparable American article is \$14.05, so that this duty would fall short of giving proper and full protection.

Take the German razor valued at over \$4 per dozen. The duty is 50 cents each and 50 per cent ad valorem. On the average of all of these, the foreign value is \$5.94. The landing cost is 51 cents, the specific duty is 50 cents each, amounting to \$6 on the dozen, and the 50 per cent ad valorem would be \$2.97. That would make it \$15.42, and if we allowed them 20 per cent profit and overhead, which would amount to \$3.08, it would bring the article up to \$18.50 per dozen, while the domestic article is selling for a little less than that, namely, \$17.30 per dozen. With a little less than 20 per cent, the article would sell for about the same. The English product would be brought to above the selling price of the American product, \$15.74 for the English article landed, the domestic article selling for \$13.20.

This gives a general view of the proposed duty and its effect upon the general classes of imported razors.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, I want to express my appreciation for two things this morning: First, that the committee has brought in an amendment of its previous proposal, very appreciably reducing the rates of duty on some of these razors. Secondly, I wish to express my appreciation for something which I have been hoping for since we began the consideration of this bill. The chairman of the Finance Committee has presented to the Senate, in connection with this paragraph, the reasons for the rates of duty which the Finance Committee proposes. This I believe is the first time since we began the consideration of the bill that that has been done. I have rather caustically criticized the hitherto apparent intention of not explaining anything. I have felt that the committee owed it to itself and to the country to give some reason, whether well founded or not, for these very large increases in duty above the rates in the existing law, and in many cases above the rates in any law which we have ever had in this country.

I am going to demonstrate my appreciation by limiting the discussion of these items. I am enabled to do that by the course which the chairman of the committee has pursued this morning. He has given us at the outset the reasons which actuated the committee in doing what has been done, and again I want to express my appreciation for this very considerate act on the part of the chairman of the committee in offering his reasons, and also for the reductions which he has proposed this morning. There are some details, however, which I think it is important the Senate should know, and I shall very briefly refer to them.

In the first place, this paragraph as amended brings into the bill specifically a new item—safety razors and safety-razor handles and frames. Hitherto that class of razors and parts has not been specifically mentioned in any tariff bill. The original proposal of the committee was to impose a duty of 20 cents each and 30 per cent ad valorem, not only on the safety razors but on the safety-razor handles and frames, and now it has changed that to a specific duty of 10 cents each, which, of course, will be recognized as amounting to \$1.20 per dozen.

The values of these razors are designated as all the way from 75 cents per dozen up to \$4 per dozen, so the importance of this amendment, as it relates to the cheaper grades of safety razors, is very easily seen. In many cases it amounts to a reduction of more than 100 per cent of the foreign cost of the razor.

In considering the subject, I should like to inquire of the chairman of the committee what will be the ad valorem rate upon safety razors in the different classes which are ordinarily imported into this country?

Mr. McCUMBER. Safety razors are coming in now at about 10 cents each, foreign valuation. If we charged 10 cents each, that would be 100 per cent, and if we add 30 per cent, as we have here, it means 130 per cent.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. The Senator says they are coming in at about a dollar a dozen?

Mr. McCUMBER. No; they are coming in at about \$1.20 a dozen. Of course, that includes the case and all, as a Senator near me suggests. The committee have cut that down to 10 cents each and 30 per cent ad valorem, which is equivalent to 130 per cent ad valorem on razors of that price. That is the cheaper class.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. The reduction of the 10 cents each which the committee proposes this morning of course would be a reduction of 100 per cent. I inquire, further, what the rate of duty is under the present law. Under what basket clause do those safety razors fall under the present law, and what is the present rate of duty?

Mr. McLEAN. Safety razors are found in paragraph 358, the same as other razors. The rate is 55 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I want to call attention to the fact that so far as safety razors are concerned we are exporters of safety razors to all the countries of the world. They are

made by automatic machines. It is true there have been some importations of safety razors, but they are safety razors of a very inferior quality, I am advised. So far as the general trend of prices of the better class of razors is concerned, I do not believe there is any reason to fear that the American producer can not compete with the world. He has been doing that in the past; he has been competing with Germany in other countries, and is doing it to-day.

It is true that Germany is producing a cheap safety razor that is finding a market in all countries, but that does not prevent the American manufacturer, so far as a reasonably good grade of razors is concerned, from meeting competition anywhere, and that is only in keeping with business conditions in our country. When there is a product which can be manufactured by machinery, and when there can be quantity production, America stands at the front of all the nations of the earth. Our inventive genius, our skill, our aggressiveness, our ability to organize are superior to those of any other nation. Our facilities, our resources, our material are unexcelled anywhere, and as to this article it is not only produced by machinery, but it is produced by automatic machinery, and there is no danger of competition in comparable articles anywhere on earth.

It has been said by the chairman of the committee that the cheaper safety razors ought to be excluded. I am rather inclined to agree with him. I think in many cases they are imposing upon the public by offering such razors. That certainly applies to the cheaper straight-handled razors. Whether it does or not with regard to safety razors, I am not especially informed, but I assume that must be the case. I am informed, as to the cheap blades of the safety razors sent over to this country from Germany, that they are worthless. They are certainly an imposition upon the people of the country, and as to those I am inclined to agree that we should virtually put an embargo upon them. We do not want to have our people deceived by such devices.

But when we come to the medium grades and to the better grades, there is no use in piling up the same kind of a duty there for the same purpose. The committee this morning brings in a reduction of the duty as to the very cheap razors, and I am inclined to think it is justified and should be done; in fact, I do think so, because what is left, I believe, will be great enough to amount virtually to an embargo on the cheap razors.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, the Senator said something a moment ago about an embargo, but I did not understand exactly what it is on.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. It is on the very cheap razor which, of course, does not serve, I think, any useful purpose in most cases. It has the effect of deceiving the buyers in many cases.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. McLEAN. I have one of those razors landed in this country at \$1.22 a dozen. If the Senator from Ohio would like to examine it, I will have one of the pages take it to him.

Mr. POMERENE. I was engaged on another matter at the moment and did not understand clearly what the Senator said.

Mr. McLEAN. I thought the Senator from Ohio inquired of the Senator from New Mexico as to the quality of the cheap razor he was discussing. I have one here and I would like to have the Senator examine it if he would like to do so.

Mr. POMERENE. I have not any objection to examining it.

Mr. McLEAN. I do not think it would shave anything but the purse of the man who bought it.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I do not know that I am going to make any special objection to the rate which the committee proposes upon the cheap razors. The rates are very greatly reduced from what they were originally. I think the rates were decidedly too high at first, but they have been very materially modified. At this time I am not disposed to make any objection, but when it comes to the better grade I think that the rate of duty is decidedly too large, and I shall offer some amendments there.

As to the safety razors, I do not believe we need any such high duties. I think we can compete with the world in safety razors.

Mr. McCUMBER. At least, if the Senator will allow me, if a safety razor that is worth anything can be brought into this country for 10 cents, landed here at 10 cents, it is not an imposition, I think, upon the average user of the safety razor if he has to pay another 10 cents and then add 3 cents on top of that, which would make it 23 cents. If the razor is worth anything at all, we certainly ought not to complain of the price that would make it cost at wholesale 23 cents and perhaps sell at retail for double the amount at least, or possibly 50 cents. It does seem to me that if it can be sold

for that we ought to have a duty that would arrest their importation. If it is not worth that price, it ought not to be imported at all.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. The Senator will observe, however, that the rates of duties apply to all safety razors, and when we get up into the class of reasonably good safety razors we undoubtedly compete with the world. To put a duty of 10 cents each ad valorem upon grades which are useful to mankind and which are exported all over the world, it seems to me, is giving an opportunity to the producer of those razors in this country to oppress in a sense the people of the United States who use razors.

Mr. McCUMBER. Of course, if the Senator will again allow me, while we had a patent right upon the razor and it could not be manufactured by anyone else, we could export them all over the world and make enormous profits, and undoubtedly the Gillette Razor Co. did make enormous profits upon the razors under their patent rights. But now that the patent has expired I am very doubtful if that company or any other American company will be able to export any considerable number as against what they can be produced for in the foreign country. My understanding is that it would cost at least three times as much to produce in this country razors of the several kinds as it would cost in Germany or France.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Notwithstanding the statement of the Senator, the history is that we are exporting these razors in competition with the world. Just listen to some facts bearing on the razor industry. The last report of domestic production was in 1919, but in that year we produced in this country a little over \$24,500,000 worth. We exported \$2,300,870 worth and we imported \$488,634 worth. That was of razors of all kinds.

Mr. POMERENE. May I ask the Senator to give the production in this country?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. A little over \$24,500,000.

Mr. POMERENE. In what year?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. In 1919.

Mr. POMERENE. The Summary of Tariff Information states that the production of razors, safety and straight, was valued at over \$5,000,000 in 1914. Has it increased so largely?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. It shows that enormous increase in 1919.

Mr. McLEAN. Has the Senator the figures for 1921?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. No; I have not the figures for 1921. In fact, no one has. We do not know what the production has been since 1919.

Mr. McLEAN. The Senator knows that this razor was covered by a patent in 1919 and since that time the patent has expired.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I take it that will not make any difference in the quantity of production unless it be to increase the quantity. Usually where an item is controlled by a patent it operates to restrict production and keep up the price.

That is the situation regarding the razor industry. I want to call attention to the question of prices and the tendency of those prices, as they come from Germany, of the better grades of razors. Prior to the war a razor which was a good razor—I suppose there is no better on the market, the "Red Injun" brand, No. 101—was sold at 24 marks 30 pfennigs. On January 1 of this year its price had increased in marks 3,600 per cent, or to 899 marks 10 pfennigs. On January 1, with the mark at 36, which is about one-third of a cent, that razor cost \$3.23, foreign cost. If we add the present duty of 55 per cent, the amount of the duty would be \$1.78. Then allowing 5 per cent for expenses and transportation, which would be 16 cents, the landed cost would be \$5.17. On March 15 that razor had advanced 4,400 per cent above the pre-war price to 1,093 marks 50 pfennigs, and, calculated on the same basis, that would give a landed cost of \$6.33.

On May 15 there was a further advance of 25 per cent, which would make the foreign cost \$3.94, the duty of 55 per cent \$2.16, and 20 cents landing cost, which would give a landed cost of \$6.30. On May 15 an advance of 25 per cent would make the foreign price \$7.22, the present duty \$3.97, the landing expense 29 cents, making a landed cost of \$11.48. The present American selling price of that razor, according to my authority, is \$11.

Mr. McLEAN. May I ask the Senator what his authority is?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. My authority is H. Boker & Co. (Inc.).

Mr. McLEAN. That is the same importer whom the Senator quoted yesterday?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Yes.

Mr. McLEAN. Now, let me call the attention of the Senator to the facts with regard to this particular article. I have them here. It is the "Red Injun" Boker razor, no better made.

This razor was imported in August last at \$7.51 a dozen. That is without the duty. The authority for that is the Reynolds report. Now, the experts who have the matter in charge report that the same razor was landed in this country in April, 1922, at \$3.15 per dozen.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. May I ask by whom?

Mr. McLEAN. By H. Boker Hardware Cutlery Co., the same authority that the Senator is quoting here and asks us to believe. The fact is they control this brand absolutely. Why they should deem it worth while to try to deceive the Senator from New Mexico in this matter I can not conceive.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, of course I am at a loss to understand the situation.

Mr. McLEAN. I confess that I am. If the Senator will pardon me, while I am on my feet, here [exhibiting] is another high-grade razor, No. 10. By the authority of the Reynolds report—this is the information we get from the expert who was selected to give to the Committee on Finance as accurate information as could be obtained—this razor was landed in August last at \$4.82 a dozen, and in April, 1922, at \$3.08 a dozen.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, I, of course, have nothing of a specific nature to offer in opposition to what the Senator from Connecticut has stated.

Mr. McLEAN. The rates proposed by the committee do not begin to equalize the difference in the production costs in this case.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I am constrained to believe, however, that there is something peculiar with reference to the particular importations to which the Senator has referred. We all know that prices generally in Germany have been increasing, and there must be something in connection with those importations peculiar to the transactions themselves. I can not imagine that there has been any such general occurrence as that to which the Senator has referred.

Mr. McLEAN. My information is—and I get it from the same experts who were employed by the Committee on Finance when the Underwood bill was framed, who, I think, are honorable men—that these importations were passed upon by the agent of Boker & Co. for comparability, the very firm which the Senator is quoting.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I, of course, have no other explanation than that which I have offered; but I should like very much to get from H. Boker & Co. some explanation of the situation, because the general trend of prices in the industries of Germany is not in that direction, as the Senator from Connecticut must admit, it seems to me. We have indisputable evidence that the trend of prices in Germany is upward on all commodities, and to say that there should have been a reduction in the price of razors, taking the dates of August, 1921, and April of this year, of what I believe amounts to 50 per cent or more in some cases, is inconceivable to me. It certainly is not consistent with the trend of business in Germany.

Mr. McLEAN. These figures were taken from actual invoices of goods which were imported into this country—

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. That may all be true.

Mr. McLEAN. And the Government collected the duty on that basis. I think that Boker & Co. owe the Senator from New Mexico an explanation.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I hope there will be an explanation of the colloquy which has just taken place.

Mr. McLEAN. I will say to the Senator, with regard to the cutlery industry, razors, shears, and penknives, that Germany is at this time making a special drive. There is no question about that; the imports so indicate. The imports of razors have almost doubled in quantity since the 1st of January last. In January last there were imported 67,000 dozen; in February there were imported 78,000 dozen; in March there were imported over 102,000 dozen; and in April there were imported 96,000 dozen. I submit to the Senator that the facts demonstrate that Germany is making a special drive upon these industries, and if the Senator has read the testimony which was taken before the Finance Committee of the Senate—

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I heard the testimony.

Mr. McLEAN. He will realize that the razor industry especially is practically out of business at the present time. The concern in New York which ordinarily employs 700 men has only about 90 men at work at present, and they are working only three days in the week. The firm is just keeping their organization together. That applies to the manufacture of the better razors.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. But the Senator realizes, does he not, that the present situation is only temporary?

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. President, the Senator must also realize that if the concerns in this country have to quit business and

dissolve, the American consumer will then be at the mercy of the foreign razor monopoly. If the domestic manufacturers are to have any relief at all, they must have adequate protection for the time being. We have been very moderate in the rates allowed; the manufacturers would clearly be entitled to higher rates than we have provided, and we would have been compelled to allow higher rates but for the fact that we have provided in this bill in the event the rates are not high enough that the industry may go to the President of the United States and secure reasonable protection. Reasonable protection is all we want, and the figures demonstrate that the rates here provided are lower than conditions to-day demand. It is too late to save a man after he is dead, and it will be too late to save this industry after the organization has been dissolved and the workers have found employment in other industries.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico pardon an interruption?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I yield.

Mr. SIMMONS. I wish to ask the Senator from Connecticut a question. Did I understand him to say that the foreign razors were imported at \$3.50?

Mr. McLEAN. The Boker razor was imported at \$3.15 per dozen.

Mr. SIMMONS. They were not appraised at \$3.15, but were imported at that price?

Mr. McLEAN. They were appraised at \$3.15, and the duty was paid on that appraisement, as I am informed.

Mr. SIMMONS. They were appraised at the same rate as they were invoiced, then?

Mr. McLEAN. That is my information.

Mr. SIMMONS. I merely wanted to make the inquiry of the Senator.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I yield.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Here [exhibiting] is a razor that was imported on September 16, 1921, for 380 marks a dozen. The mark at that time was worth nine hundred and thirty-eight one-thousandths of 1 cent, so that the cost of that razor, foreign value, was \$3.56 per dozen. The landing charge in Chicago, or at some other point in the West, was 18 cents. The specific duty at 40 cents each would be \$4.80; the ad valorem duty of 50 per cent would be \$1.78, making a total of \$10.33, plus 20 per cent profit, or \$2.06, or a grand total of \$12.38 per dozen in this country. The wholesale selling price for the comparable domestic razor is \$17.05. So that even with the duty of 40 cents each on razors valued at between \$3 and \$4, the duty falls short of being sufficient to protect American industry against foreign competition in that razor.

Here [exhibiting] is the invoice of the article. I may add that to-day the spread on that razor is a great deal wider because the mark is worth only about a quarter of a cent.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Does the Senator believe that that razor is coming in to-day at any such price as he has mentioned?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I have a memorandum of a large shipment of razors covered by the same bracket which recently came in which shows a great deal wider spread than in this instance. I think the information will be procurable later. Possibly the Senator would like to see the invoice price of the razor to which I have referred.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, what is the price of the razor made in the United States which is comparable to the foreign razor to which he has referred?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The wholesale selling price of the domestic article is \$17.05 per dozen.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. That amounts to nearly \$1.50 each and the foreign razor, as I understand, is sold for 134 marks. Is that correct?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The foreign razor sold for 380 marks per dozen.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I think the Senator probably misread the figures. The bill here was for only one-twelfth of a dozen. I think the Senator was mistaken to that extent.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. No; it covers one dozen razors.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Here is the way the bill reads:

We sent you by one parcel post one pattern goods, postage 2.50, package 1.50, 4.

I suppose that means 4 marks.

One-twelfth dozen razors No. 1041, five-eighths oval, imitation shell handle, 400; 5021, six-eighths flat, bone handle, 380; 780.

That means 780 marks, I imagine.

One-twelfth of 780, 130 marks.

And adding 4 marks previously mentioned makes 134 marks for the one razor, if I am able to understand this bill.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The manufacturer who handed me the memorandum stated that the invoice was for one dozen razors at 380 marks.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. What would be the equivalent in gold? It would be less than 1 cent apiece. There must be a mistake about it, for that is impossible.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Four hundred marks at 1 cent would be practically \$4, or, at the equivalent of a little less than 1 cent, \$3.56.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, the Senator said the mark was worth a quarter of a cent—not a cent.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. The Senator is clearly mistaken, I think, because the bill as I read it means one razor, one-twelfth of a dozen; but, even at that, 134 marks, at 3 marks to the cent, would be about 45 or 50 cents for this razor.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. At the time of that invoice the mark was worth a little short of 1 cent, nine hundred and thirty-eight one-thousandths of a cent; and 400 marks at nine hundred and thirty-eight one-thousandths of a cent is \$3.56, which was the price per dozen of this razor. That is the statement that is made.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, the Senator is certainly mistaken as to the bill being for a dozen razors. It states on its face that it is for one-twelfth of a dozen, and there can be no other explanation for it, it seems to me. Of course, however, the price of the razor as measured in gold at that time was very low, and if the mark was worth 1 cent at that time it has been greatly reduced since; and if these prices in marks had decreased proportionately of course the landed cost of such razors would be comparatively nominal. The general trend of these goods, however, is upward, notwithstanding what may develop here regarding these prices; and I am advised that at the present time these goods are not billed out in marks at all, that they are billed out in dollars, and that the price of the article has been fixed at 25 per cent above the pre-war price.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. President, where does the Senator get his information?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I got that from an affidavit which I put into the RECORD night before last.

Mr. McLEAN. I understand that they are still being billed in marks.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. They are not being billed in marks now except on a few trades which were made prior to the 15th of May.

Mr. McLEAN. Does this information come from Boker?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. It does. I put the affidavit in the RECORD the other day.

Mr. McLEAN. His last invoice was billed in marks.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. That is true, doubtless, on arrangements made before this law went into effect, and the old contracts are to be carried out—the contracts which were made, as I understand, prior to the 15th of May. If those contracts were what are known as firm contracts—that is, fixed contracts, regardless of the variation in exchange or price—they can still be billed out at the price agreed upon in marks before that date; but since the 15th of May no new contracts are being made, as I am informed, for any of these goods to be priced or billed out in marks, and by the 1st of September, even though there may be old contracts, they must be billed out in dollars, and the price will be the pre-war price plus 25 per cent.

Of course, if Senators on the other side of the Chamber are preparing this bill with the view of meeting this temporary situation, and are aiming it solely at the prices which have been presented here, I think they should not only go as far as they have gone but, if they are acting upon that kind of a situation, they ought to go even farther. If they are going to deal with it through a tariff, if they want to meet that German situation, and if it is as Senators would have us believe, their rates are not high enough yet. They do not meet that condition; but here is what they are doing: They are putting an embargo upon anything from England or France and they are not meeting the German situation.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I want to call the attention of the Senator from New Mexico to the testimony of Mr. H. L. Henry before the committee, combating Mr. Boker's contention in reference to razors. He gives a quotation as to the price in this country, as I understand, of razors comparable with this that Mr. Boker was speaking about, to whose testimony he was replying. I understood the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] to say a few moments ago that the American-made razor with which he was attempting to compare this cheap German razor sold at \$17, or something like that, per

dozen. I was glancing over the testimony of Mr. Henry before the committee, and, as I understood Mr. Henry, he was confusing some statements made by Mr. Boker with reference to the prices of German and American made razors, and in the course of his testimony he had occasion to fortify his own testimony as to the price. In quoting the price of the American-made razor Mr. Boker, as I understand, in his testimony sought to compare the German razor. Mr. Henry saw fit to incorporate in the record testimony from the J. R. Torrey Razor Co. to support his contention as to the price of the American comparable razor. Mr. Torrey does not fix the price at \$18 or \$17 or \$16, either, in his telegram. Here it is:

Wishing to check that statement—

That was the statement with reference to the comparison of a German razor that cost \$1.17 a dozen in American currency with an American-made razor. Here is what he says:

Wishing to check that statement and testimony, I talked with Worcester, Mass., over the phone last night, and I have here a telegram signed by the J. R. Torrey Razor Co., and I will read it—

Here it is—

Last quotation to Kaster, April 14, 1920, \$4.05 per dozen. Last order, August 12, 1918, \$3.70. If more information is wanted, wire or phone.

J. R. TORREY RAZOR CO.

As I understand that—and Senators have the book that I am reading from, page 1946 of the hearings before the Finance Committee, Schedule 3—the comparable American-made razor does not sell in this market, according to Mr. Torrey, for \$17, but sold for \$3.70 in 1918, and \$4.05 in 1920.

It is mighty well, in considering these things, to see that you are comparing the foreign article with some American article of something like the same quality, something like the same intrinsic value; and I am quite sure that the Senator from New Jersey, in quoting the comparable American razor at \$17, had some razor that was of very far superior quality to the German razor with which he was comparing it.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico obtained the floor.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I yield.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I stated that the price of the sample which I submitted to the Senate was 380 marks per dozen. This invoice is an invoice submitting two sample razors and quoting the prices—one No. 1041, oval imitation shell handle, 400 marks; another item, No. 5021, flat bone handle, 380 marks; total, 780 marks for a dozen of each of those two types. One-twelfth of 780 marks is 65 marks, or, for two, 130 marks. In other words, this is an invoice quotation price, an official record, showing that Friedrich Ern & Co. offered to deliver those razors in America for 380 marks per dozen in September of 1921—a dozen of them. Three hundred and eighty marks at that time was worth \$3.56, according to the computation of the exchange and verification by the appraisers, so that razor was quoted at \$3.56 per dozen.

I have in my hand an American razor, comparable in quality and style, handed me by the appraiser. The domestic selling price is \$18.20 a dozen. So, in presenting that illustration to the Senate, I am backed up by the invoice selling price; and the sample handed me by the appraiser, the expert who passes on these customs duties, shows that the American manufacturer, at a domestic selling price of \$18.20 a dozen, has to compete with a razor selling for \$3.56 a dozen, which, with this ad valorem duty, will carry a price of \$12.38. I do not believe the Senate wants any better evidence than that.

Mr. SIMMONS. I want to ask the Senator one question, if the Senator from New Mexico will permit me. The Senator has exhibited one invoice, and only one invoice. Has the Senator any more invoices?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Yes; I have some more. If the Senator will wait until they can be figured, I shall be very glad to present them.

Mr. SIMMONS. I have no objection to waiting.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, I am glad these colloquies have taken place. If there could be a demonstration of anything, it seems to me it has been demonstrated that the Congress of the United States is following some will-o'-the-wisp. It is out upon an adventure which can not result in any permanent good to the country or to the industries of the country. It shows how futile it is to attempt to deal with this problem by a tariff. It should be dealt with in some other way. It shows also upon what flimsy testimony, upon what uncertain testimony, we are called upon to act.

I just wonder how an unbiased mind would be affected by what has occurred here this morning. Considering the testimony which I have presented, considering the evidence which I

incorporated in the Record yesterday evening, as to the upward trend, not only the upward trend but the upward course, by leaps and bounds, of prices in Germany, measured in marks and in gold, and considering the statements which have been presented here this morning, I just wonder how an unprejudiced mind is going to view this situation. Can anyone be impressed that this is a solution of the difficulty? Can anyone feel that this is really a hopeful attempt to deal with the difficulty? I wish that all Senators could have heard the colloquies this morning, and then that they should exercise their honest judgment as to what should be done. I do not think the proposals of the committee meet this situation at all. If the evidence which I have produced means anything, it means that you are soon to have an embargo even upon the goods from Germany. Certainly you will have an embargo upon the goods which are usually imported from England and France.

If you accept the statements coming from the other side, and all that they have asked us to infer from them, the country is going to be swamped under this great importation of razors from Germany. They are going to drive out of business every razor-producing concern in this country, and that notwithstanding these greatly increased duties proposed here.

All I can say is that the evidence which we have before us does not warrant action on the subject at this time.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STERLING in the chair). Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SIMMONS. Does the Senator understand that the prices given us as to these German razors relate to the finer qualities of razors, such as that exhibited a little while ago by the Senator from New Jersey? That looked like a pretty fine razor. I was engaged in other matters, but I thought I heard something coming from the other side of the Chamber, when we first began the debate this morning, about some of these German razors being so poor that they would not shave at all.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Yes; but I am advised that the razor which was being discussed by the Senator from New Jersey is a good razor.

Mr. SIMMONS. It is an American-made razor?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. The one he produced was a German razor, comparable to a good American razor.

Mr. SIMMONS. It is a razor that will shave?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Yes; it will shave.

Mr. SIMMONS. It is a German razor worth, at the foreign price, over \$1 a dozen?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Yes; the foreign price of that razor is considerably over \$1 a dozen.

Mr. SIMMONS. I see in this information furnished by the Tariff Commission, that of razors valued at more than \$1 a dozen, in 1918 very few came in, but after the war, in 1920, only \$375,000 worth came in, and in nine months of 1921 only \$345,000 worth. It does seem to me that if you could buy these German razors, worth over \$1 a dozen, as cheaply as they say they could be purchased, as compared with the American price, the American market would probably have been flooded with them this past year—that every importer dealing in razors would have had a pretty good supply for the American market. But it appears that those low prices did not attract very much attention from the importers of razors, in view of the fact that they imported in nine months of last year only a little over a quarter of a million dollars' worth.

The outstanding facts of the situation do not seem to fortify or even to justify the contention made here. There is something wrong about this comparison. That is the trouble about the whole thing; there is something wrong about the comparison of the articles.

But I want to suggest to the Senator from New Mexico, if he has not any further presentation he wishes to make, that we take a vote on this.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I merely wish to make one suggestion further—that I do not believe the Senate has sufficient information on which to act at this time. I shall not propose any amendments to this paragraph but shall content myself with voting against the proposals of the committee.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I want to put one little statement in the Record, as to importations, which, I think, will at least be of interest to those who wish to investigate the subject.

In the calendar year 1921 there were imported into the United States 46,657 dozen razors—not parts of razors, but razors. That, in round numbers, amounts to 659,884 razors of a variety worth less than \$1 per dozen. The importing price of the entire amount of razors was 67 cents a dozen, or 5½ cents each.

In the same year there were imported, of razors worth \$1 or more a dozen, 119,883 dozen, which amounts to 1,428,596 razors. Those came in at \$3.52 a dozen on the average, which amounts to about 30 cents each.

The total amount imported during 1921 was 2,088,480 razors. I have an idea that those which came in at 5½ cents each should not have come in at all, because the razor that is made that cheaply any place upon the face of the earth can not be intended for shaving purposes, but is intended only to increase the amount of sales in a general store by enabling them to offer the inducement of coupons.

I want the Senator to refer to the first three months of 1922. In that period there were imported 91,722 dozen razors, or 1,100,664 razors. If the importations come in for the balance of the year at the same rate we will have imported razors during the year 1922 to the amount of 4,402,656, and if we continue that for a year or two longer every American citizen of the whisk-broom variety can be shaving with a foreign razor.

Mr. President, while I am on my feet, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate closes its session for this calendar day it shall take a recess until Monday at 11 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I simply want to observe that in the statistics the Senator has just furnished the Senate he grouped all kinds of razors and gave us the total number of razors imported, without reference to the value of the razors. I was not doing that. At the time I took the floor we were not discussing all kinds of razors. We were discussing importations of foreign razors worth over \$1 a dozen, and I gave the Senate the information furnished by the Tariff Commission with reference to the importations of that particular razor, the one under discussion.

If the figures are erroneous, I am not responsible for the error. The book was furnished us by the Finance Committee for the purpose of informing us and giving us the facts, and I read it just as it was written. There are several tables, one of "all razors, finished and unfinished." I did not read that. Then there is a table of "razors, finished, valued at more than \$1 per dozen." That is the kind of razors we were discussing. I read those figures. The statement is to the effect that in 1920 there were only 67,516 dozen—I presume it is dozen, though it does not state—valued at \$375,675. I gave it in round numbers a little while ago. For the nine months of 1921 the figures are 87,087 dozen, valued at \$345,108.

Mr. McCUMBER. I think that is right. We have continued it up to the end of the calendar year, and at the end of the calendar year those above \$1 per dozen amounted to 119,183 dozen, which multiplied by 12 would give us 1,428,596 razors. Their value, without going into the whole sum, I gave as \$3.62 a dozen, or 30 cents each.

Mr. SIMMONS. I do not think that changes my figures very much. I have the importations for 9 months, and the Senator gave them for 12 months of 1921. It appears that they amounted to \$433,404 as to the kind of razor about which I have been talking. So the argument I made a little while ago so far as this particular razor is concerned holds good. I think we ought to have a vote on the subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, in paragraph 358, on page 76, in line 9, after the word "maker," to insert the words "or purchaser," and in line 10 to strike out the word "die-sunk" and insert the words "die sunk," so as to make the proviso read:

Provided further, That all articles specified in this paragraph, when imported, shall have the name of the maker or purchaser and beneath the same the name of the country of origin die sunk conspicuously and indelibly on the blade or shank or tang of each and every blade and on safety razors and parts thereof.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCUMBER. I believe that finishes paragraph 358. I understand that all the amendments to it have been agreed to now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All the amendments in paragraph 358 have been agreed to.

Mr. McCUMBER. Then, I ask that we may recur to page 84, paragraph 374, aluminum, aluminum scrap, and alloys.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, may we not deal with paragraphs 359 and 360 before taking up paragraph 374?

Mr. McCUMBER. I think the committee are desirous of giving those two paragraphs a little further consideration. We try to meet each morning and to cover the paragraphs as much as we can, but we are a little behind. I hope the Senator will let us carry those over.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Of course, I defer to the desire of the chairman of the committee.

Mr. McCUMBER. Then, I ask that we proceed with paragraph 374.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated. The READING CLERK. On page 84, in line 18, before the word "plates," insert the word "coils" and a comma, so as to make the paragraph read:

PAR. 374. Aluminum, aluminum scrap, and alloys of any kind in which aluminum is the component material of chief value, in crude form, 5 cents per pound; in coils, plates, sheets, bars, rods, circles, disks, blanks, strips, rectangles, and squares, 9 cents per pound.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I am going to ask the Senator from North Dakota to let that item go over. I was under the impression that the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] had been investigating the item and was ready to discuss it, but I find there was some misunderstanding and that he has not done so. So I will ask the Senator from North Dakota if he will not permit that paragraph to go over. As I said, I was relying upon the Senator from Utah. I thought he had investigated that item and would be prepared to discuss it.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator has reference to paragraph 374?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes. I find there has been a misunderstanding. The Senator from Utah did not have any notice that he was expected to look into it.

Mr. McCUMBER. May I ask the Senator if there is any objection to agreeing to the amendment in that paragraph? The only amendment is to insert the word "coils."

Mr. SIMMONS. Oh, no; not at all. Let the amendment be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. KING. Let it be understood, if the Senator from North Dakota will permit, that a motion shall be made when we return to this section, after all the committee amendments have been agreed to, to reduce the rate and that we may reconsider the action of the Senate in inserting the word "coils," and include that in the general amendment for a reduction.

Mr. McCUMBER. That may be understood. I ask now that we may proceed with paragraph 375—metallic magnesium and metallic magnesium scrap.

Mr. SIMMONS. That is the paragraph which the Senator from North Dakota yesterday agreed with me might go over until Tuesday. I presume he has forgotten it.

Mr. McCUMBER. I can not keep track of all the agreements of that character which I make on the floor. If the Senator reminds me that that was the agreement, I will, of course, pass it over.

Mr. SIMMONS. That was our agreement in private conversation and not upon the floor.

Mr. McCUMBER. Very well. Has the Senator from North Carolina any objection to concluding paragraph 376?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ODDIE in the chair). The Chair is informed that all the amendments to paragraph 376 have been agreed to.

Mr. SIMMONS. May I ask when paragraph 376 was agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On May 22.

Mr. SIMMONS. In other words, it was acted upon at that time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It was.

Mr. SIMMONS. Very well.

Mr. McCUMBER. Then let us proceed with the next one—paragraph 376a.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 85, after line 5, the committee proposes to insert a new paragraph, as follows:

PAR. 376a. Bismuth, 7½ per cent ad valorem.

Mr. SIMMONS. With reference to this paragraph I desire to ask the Senator from North Dakota if he will not give the Senate some information. That is a new provision in the bill. There is nothing about it in the House bill. I find no information upon the subject in any of the books that have been available to me. I presume, however, the Senator from North Dakota will have no difficulty in giving the Senate the reasons for putting this article on the dutiable list and at a rate of 7½ per cent ad valorem.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I have just sent for the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOR], who has this particular paragraph in charge, and I think he will be here in a moment. We can pass that over until he returns, and I will ask that we go on with the next paragraph, if that is satisfactory to the Senator.

Mr. SIMMONS. Perfectly so.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 85, after line 6, the committee proposes to insert a new paragraph:

PAR. 376b. Cadmium, 15 cents per pound.

Mr. SIMMONS. That is in the same category as 376a. Paragraph 376b is a new subject upon which there is no information so far as I have been able to find. I would like to have some information presented to the Senate before a vote is taken. It is in the same category as 376a. It is a new item, which the Senate committee has engrafted into the bill, and upon which I find no satisfactory information.

Mr. McCUMBER. I will give the Senator a little information. Whether it will be satisfactory, of course I can not say.

Mr. SIMMONS. I do not know that it will be, but I would like for the Senate to have what information the Senator has.

Mr. McCUMBER. I will give such information as I have. Practically the entire world supply of cadmium comes from Germany and the United States. The production in this country expanded enormously during the war owing to the shortage of tin. Whereas the output in 1914 had increased to only 90,000 pounds annually, 207,000 pounds were recovered in 1917. Since then the production has declined until only about 65,000 pounds were recovered in 1921. This production in output is in part attributable to the increased output of cadmium sulphide, which can be alternatively produced from the same material as the metal. The main factors in the situation are the large stocks accumulated between 1916 and 1918, which have not yet been disbursed, although consumption in the last year or two has exceeded production. The cost of production of cadmium is impossible to ascertain, owing to the fact that each of the five producing companies employ different accounting methods.

Cadmium is a by-product, most of it being obtained in connection with the treatment of zinc ores. It is evident, however, that none of the companies are able to recover the metal at less than \$1 per pound, and the American selling price is nominally between \$1.10 and \$1.25 per pound. Some producers figure their costs for 1921 as high as \$1.69 per pound.

Domestic manufacturers have asked the committee for a duty of 25 cents per pound, or about 30 per cent on the American selling price. In their argument they urged that this would be necessary in order to protect the raw-material resources of this country. Large quantities of cadmium have been wasted. The Geological Survey estimates that fully 600 short tons of cadmium accumulates annually in the various plants of this country. Germany has again entered the market and was offering this metal at 75 cents per pound in the latter part of 1921.

While at least 35 cents will be required to balance the price in Germany and the United States, the committee felt that 15 cents per pound would serve to stabilize the American industry, and as soon as consumption becomes a little more normal yield some revenue to the Government. Just prior to the war the average imports of cadmium ranged from 3,000 pounds in 1910 to 6,396 pounds in 1912, falling off again, however, in 1913 and 1914 to less than 2,000 pounds annually.

This briefly prepared statement presents in a nutshell the situation in reference to this metal.

Mr. SIMMONS. Then I understand the Senator does not have the foreign selling price for 1920, 1921, or 1922?

Mr. KING. The Senator from North Dakota stated that there was some of this commodity recently imported at 70 cents, but he did not give the date.

Mr. SIMMONS. Can the Senator from North Dakota give us the date when the importation was made?

Mr. McCUMBER. I have not the date here, though I could probably get it. I said it is stated in this brief résumé that—

Germany has again entered the market, and was offering this metal at 75 cents per pound in the latter part of 1921.

I have not the exact date when that offer was made.

Mr. SIMMONS. But the Senator has no figures as to the amount of the importations?

Mr. McCUMBER. I have not the figures as to importations.

Mr. SIMMONS. Probably I misunderstood him, but I understood him to say that there was some trouble with reference to the exhaustion of the raw material out of which this metal is made.

Mr. McCUMBER. No; I have not said anything about the exhaustion of the raw material.

Mr. SIMMONS. Did not the Senator make a statement, then, with reference to the inadequacy of the supply of the raw material out of which this product is made?

Mr. McCUMBER. I said this:

The production in this country expanded enormously during the war owing to the shortage of tin. Whereas the output in the year 1914 had increased only 90,000 pounds annually, 207,000 were recovered in 1917. Since then the production has declined until only about 65,000 pounds were recovered in 1921.

Mr. SIMMONS. What is our domestic consumption? Has the Senator any information about that?

Mr. McCUMBER. We evidently consumed at that time 207,000 pounds; and the tariff survey shows that in 1920 we produced 129,283 pounds. That was considerably less than the production of 1917, when we produced 207,000 pounds.

Mr. SIMMONS. Was not the production about equal to the domestic demand?

Mr. McCUMBER. There was very little imported, I will say to the Senator; but there was a big demand in 1920 when everything in the line of manufactures was booming.

Mr. SIMMONS. Then, nothing in the present situation as it has so far developed would call for any higher protective duty, but the committee is proposing to put this duty on in anticipation of something that may happen in the future.

Mr. President, I do not want to take up time on this item. I think that is an extremely unwise and unsound basis of tariff imposition, but it runs through this entire bill, and we shall not, I am sure, get that very unscientific and very unsound principle out of the bill. I do not wish to consume time in the discussion of an item of such slight consequence, its total value being very small. While I think the rate is high and that it is unjust to require the American people to pay this additional tax, it will be very small, and I am ready for a vote.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me for just a moment, I desire to say that it is obvious from the information which has been imparted and from the general information which some may have that there is no occasion for any duty whatever upon this product. It is by-product of the plants that are engaged in the smelting of zinc and lead. We know that we produce in the United States very large quantities of zinc and of lead. There is no reason why our production of zinc ore should not increase and likewise our production of lead ore. As a matter of fact, many of our western mines are only waiting a demand for lead products and for a revival of business, when the lead industry will again, it is to be hoped, enter upon a period of very great activity.

As I have stated, cadmium is a by-product. Certainly when a commodity is a by-product, resulting from the processes incident to the production of some other commodity, it should not carry the same rate of duty that would be imposed if it were what might be denominated a primary or an independent product, one which was manufactured or fabricated or developed or mined because of its own intrinsic characteristics and the use to which it was intended to be put.

Mr. McCUMBER. I want to say to the Senator with reference to the duty that it amounts, according to present prices, to about 13 per cent ad valorem. So far as cadmium being a by-product is concerned, of course it is also a by-product in foreign countries.

Mr. KING. My understanding is that under the act of 1909, and also the act of 1913, cadmium was on the free list.

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes.

Mr. KING. Then, does the Senator now contend that it carries a duty?

Mr. McCUMBER. It is proposed that it shall carry a duty, of 13 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. KING. In what act?

Mr. McCUMBER. Under the duty proposed in the pending bill.

Mr. KING. The rate would depend entirely upon the price, of course.

Mr. McCUMBER. I stated the ad valorem rate under the present price.

Mr. KING. It is obviously unfair to select present prices as the basis for the imposition of tariff rates—

Mr. SIMMONS. Present American prices.

Mr. KING. Yes, present American prices, because everybody believes, with the exception of some of the big manufacturers who think they run the country, that there will be a diminution of the wholesale prices of many American products.

I want now to call attention very briefly to some information which I desire to go into the Record in connection with the vote upon the pending amendment. This metal, as I have stated, is a by-product, and our zinc and lead deposits in the United States are almost limitless.

It is employed in dentistry, in glass coloring; * * * also as a solder, and to some extent as a substitute for tin.

Cadmium, a by-product of the zinc-smelting industry, is recovered largely from the treatment of various residues and fine dust at zinc and lead smelters.

The fine dust is collected and is utilized in the production of this by-product.

Prior to 1907 Germany was the sole producer, the output in 1913 being 81,993 pounds of metallic cadmium.

But the situation has developed with respect to the production of this commodity much the same as the situation has developed with respect to the production of arsenic. Arsenic was, and is now, a by-product from the smelting of sulphide ores. Prior to certain injunction proceedings in the courts the arsenic was cast into the atmosphere, carried by the winds, deposited upon vegetation, and constituted a menace to the lives of the people; but through the improved methods introduced in many of our smelters it has been arrested, at least in part, and is now a product of the smelting process.

It is the same with cadmium. It also is a by-product of the reduction of lead and zinc ores. It belongs to the residuum of the processes employed in the smelting operations of those two metals, and was at one time a waste material, but now, because of its value and the improved metallurgical processes employed in our smelting operations, it is being obtained, and of course there is a market for it. In 1918 six plants were engaged in the saving of this product.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me, for I have to leave the Chamber in a moment, and I wish to answer one statement which he made a short time ago. I said that under present prices the ad valorem equivalent rate would be 13 per cent. The Senator replied that we could not expect present prices to continue. I find that the last price—

Mr. KING. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me to correct him, the statement which I made was general. I said that no one, so far as I know, except some of the manufacturers who thought they had the country by the throat, expected that present high prices would be maintained. They, of course, wanted to maintain high prices, but I believed there would be a material reduction in the price of many of the commodities in use now in the United States.

Mr. McCUMBER. I was about to make a statement on the assumption which the Senator himself has made. I agree with him about that, and I stated, I think just a moment before the Senator came in, that cadmium was now being offered at 75 cents. In 1913, just prior to the war, it was coming in at 78 cents. Therefore, 15 cents per pound duty on the price of 75 cents would be equivalent to 20 per cent, and if the price of 78 cents which was in effect just before the war should be restored the ad valorem duty would be about 19 per cent.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I do not know just what pertinency the observations of my learned friend has to the issue involved.

Mr. McCUMBER. My statement merely had reference to the probability of the product coming in at about what it was prior to the war, and was designed to bring to the attention of the Senator that it is now coming in at a rate a little less than it was in 1913 and to substantiate my statement as to what the equivalent ad valorem duty would be. In any other respect, of course, my observation is not pertinent.

Mr. KING. The point I was about to make was that as science develops, as improvements are introduced into our smelting operations and into the general business activities of the country—and we are not standing still; there is progress in all of our manufacturing development—prices in the very nature of things ought to fall. Only a few years ago it would require in certain lines of industry 200 men to do what one man with improved machinery may now do.

Take it in the cotton mills of Great Britain as an illustration. We have in many of the mills of the United States the finest, most improved machinery in the world, and in some of the mills one man will do very much more work than a larger number of employees in the British mills. So we have developed the cadmium industry in the United States as a by-product, and as our mechanical appliances and our smelting machinery and our metallurgical processes have improved we have gathered up what was formerly a waste product, and are utilizing it now to advantage, just the same as in the case of the by-products of our coke ovens. A few years ago we allowed perhaps the most valuable part of the coal in our coking operations to pass off into the atmosphere, and to-day we are wasting millions and millions of dollars annually in our reduction of bituminous coal to coke. That, I may add, by way of parentheses, is one of the sins of the American people—the sin of waste. We are wasting hundreds of millions annually in the various business enterprises and activities of the United States.

Mr. President, an educational campaign should be carried on against the profligate waste of the American people in their enormous development and progress and growth. We proceed

upon the theory that nature is generous and bountiful, and that we may be profligate and wasteful and never be called to account. So here, in the case of this zinc-smelting industry, we have now a by-product; and there is no reason why cadmium produced in the manner I have indicated ought not to be sold at increasingly lower levels, and the rate at which it was sold before the war ought not to be the basis of our calculations in the future.

Let me just complete a little of this statement.

In 1920 the output in the United States was 129,283 pounds, valued at \$151,261. Germany and the United States, with England a small contributor, practically supply the world's cadmium output. It is imported as metallic stick and as the pigment cadmium yellow. There were no imports in 1918, 1919, and 1920. During the first nine months of 1921 the imports amounted to but 101 pounds, valued at \$216. That is more than \$2 a pound, instead of 75 cents a pound, as was stated by the Senator from North Dakota. So, Mr. President, if the value before the war was 78 cents a pound, it is now, it appears here, more than \$2 a pound.

Mr. President, this paragraph of course is a new one, introduced by the Senate committee, as I understand. It illustrates that somebody is always on guard here to protect all classes of industries and to insert somewhere in this bill a tariff. As stated in 1909, under the Payne-Aldrich bill, cadmium was free; in 1913 it was free; but we propose now to impose a tariff, the ad valorem equivalent of which no one can tell until we can decide just what the price of the product will be.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, the Senator has been calling attention to one little item, and it seems clear that there is no information before the Senate regarding that item on which a duty may be based according to any theory of a tariff bill ever advanced by a political party or by Congress.

Mr. KING. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, since the discussions on this bill began we have endeavored in every conceivable way to find some basic principle for this legislation. We have utterly failed. We have, however, established a situation which shows that there is no uniform basis for this bill.

In the first speech which was made here by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] the statement was made that the majority of the committee had attempted to fix these rates for the purpose of equalizing the difference between the cost of production in the United States and abroad. The discussions had not proceeded far before it became clear to everyone that no such principle had been applied. At certain times, and in connection with certain paragraphs, the statement would be made that the rates did equalize this difference, but the facts which were shown made it clear that they had never attempted to ascertain what the difference in the actual cost of production was.

Then they came to the question of prices, using that as evidence of the difference in cost of production. They have been from time to time driven from that proposition, and we have found in many of these paragraphs, bearing the same rates of duty, brought together in a jumbled mass, a vast number of articles where the production costs vary, but a uniform rate of duty is fixed. It seems to me clear, if anything is clear, that this bill is a jumble of inconsistencies and that it is made up in the main in pursuance of the request of some interested party.

The discussion this morning in regard to cutlery, it seems to me, demonstrated that this situation could not be dealt with equitably at this time regarding the great mass of articles covered by this bill, and so I expressed my approval of a statement made in the leading editorial of the Journal of Commerce and Commercial Bulletin of New York, in which I find this statement:

"This bill ought to be sent back to the Finance Committee with orders to reconstruct it. Study of its terms has shown its dangers. It has also shown the difficulty of revision on the floor. The inefficient patchwork of the Finance Committee is a tribute to cowardice and opportunism, not an evidence of change of heart. Only by general revision from the bottom up will any tolerable or workable measure be obtained."

Mr. President, if no other thing has been accomplished by the discussions upon this bill, that at least has been developed through these discussions and the consideration of this bill; and so I say I agree that that is what should be done. This bill should be sent back to the committee, and kept in the committee until it gets information on which to frame some sort of a scientific bill.

Mr. President, without reading I ask that the editorial from which I have made a short quotation be inserted in full in the RECORD in 8-point type.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[Editorial from the New York Journal of Commerce and Commercial Bulletin of Saturday, June 10, 1922.]

A TURNING POINT IN THE TARIFF.

"Not even the most casual reader of the doings of the Senate with respect to the tariff can question that the administration measure is at the cross-roads of its progress. It can not continue its purposeless and devious travels through legislative byways, but must decide between a turning that will take it more rapidly toward the statute book and a lengthy detour that now seems likely to overwhelm it in a morass of discredit. Advocates of the measure have pointed out that at the present rate the measure can not be adopted during the coming summer or autumn, and the traditional methods of 'speeding up' have largely failed.

"The only thing which has been believed likely to permit such an increase in rate of movement and allow the bill to score some real advance is reform of the schedules. That is now conceded, and hence the announcement made by the Associated Press that the Finance Committee is really rewriting the measure. Even the most besotted Members of the old régime in the Senate see that they can not 'put over' the outrage they had planned. Unquestionably the Finance Committee is making extensive changes from day to day, and it is perforce accepting more of them from other Members who can not face their constituents if they vote for the duties that had been proposed. It is true that some of the most glaring faults of the bill are being corrected here and there. The changes made within the past day or two in rates on some types of machinery afford an example of such modification.

"But can such changes on the floor really repair the defects of this dangerous and disastrous bill? Certainly not. Its fundamental faults do not lie so much in the impossible duties it imposes here and there as they do in the whole substructure of the tariff plan it puts forward. The cunningly concealed methods whereby American valuation will be introduced in a large range of cases, the extraordinary powers granted to the President, who is thus enabled at will to put rates up 50 per cent if he chooses, the scheme of retaliation against foreign countries, constitute a foundation of danger which can not be removed piecemeal. Extensive changes in administrative law and methods like those which have been provided under the guidance of the former lobbyists now members of the Tariff Commission, and by the commission of 'experts' which the Finance Committee employed, can not well be changed on the floor. Mere amendment here and there is not likely to alter their character, but will simply leave them incomplete—perhaps as harmful as ever.

"So, too, of the sporadic changes in rates at various points. A change in duties on machinery does not help much, unless the rates on other commodities, on raw materials used by machinery makers and the like, are also changed. Past experience shows that defacing a tariff bill throws it out of gear, hurts its operation, and only in isolated cases results in really repairing its essential defects. It is a whole, and the various parts of it fit more or less closely into one another. Particularly is this the case where, as in the present bill, there is a large range of rates which affect basic materials of manufacture. The cut in excessive rates on highly finished goods then leaves the producers in the position of having to bear excessive costs of production. And these basic rates have thus far tended to grow worse rather than better in the course of the Senate debate, due to the solidarity of the agricultural bloc.

"What this tariff bill needs is complete reconstruction. Public opinion since the bill first made its appearance has shown that the Nation will not endure it. Mere compromise makes things worse rather than better, and while waiting for the end of the long, dragging debate on the bill, business in a considerable number of fields is suffering. It is losing ground because of uncertainty. There has been little or none of the 'flood of imports' constantly referred to in Senate debates, but such increases as have occurred in a few minor lines, such as cutlery, cheap jewelry, and the like, are due to fears of extreme tariff protection and hasty importations to anticipate it. The tariff debate is bad for business, bad for national finance, and disastrous to the undertaking of new enterprises.

"This bill ought to be sent back to the Finance Committee with orders to reconstruct it. Study of its terms has shown its dangers. It has also shown the difficulty of revision on the floor. The inefficient patchwork of the Finance Committee is a tribute to cowardice and opportunism, not an evidence of change of heart. Only by general revision from the bottom up will any tolerable or workable measure be obtained. It would be far

better to do what President Harding was asked to favor—repass the Payne-Aldrich bill—than to go on with the measure which has resulted from the blundering and the political bargaining of the dwarfish epigoni who have found the shoes of the old Senate oligarchy too large for them."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Overhue, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 204) to authorize the loan by the Secretary of War to the commander in chief of the United Confederate Veterans of cots for the use of the members of the United Confederate Veterans during the sessions of the national encampment of the United Confederate Veterans at Richmond, Va., from June 19 to 22, 1922.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 2664. An act for the relief of Jesse Goodin; and

S. 2666. An act for the relief of Ed Thomas and Pauline Thomas.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 211. An act to extend the provisions of the pension act of May 11, 1912, and May 1, 1920, to the officers and enlisted men of all State militia and other State organizations that rendered service to the Union cause during the Civil War for a period of 90 days or more, and providing pensions for their widows, minor children, and dependent parents, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3836. An act for the relief of Nolan P. Benner;

H. R. 6926. An act for the relief of Abraham Leibovitz;

H. R. 8214. An act to compensate the owners of the American steamship *Vindal* for damages and expenses in repairing the said steamship, and to make an appropriation therefor;

H. R. 8264. An act for the relief of Thomas B. Smith;

H. R. 8448. An act for the relief of Joseph Zitek;

H. R. 9626. An act granting a deed of quitclaim and release to the Traders' Brokerage Co., a corporation, of certain land in the city of Pensacola, Fla.;

H. R. 9746. An act for the relief of Emmett Otto Cooney;

H. R. 10234. An act for the relief of Edward A. Purdy;

H. R. 10419. An act validating certain applications for and entries of public lands;

H. R. 10675. An act for the relief of Henry McGuire; and

H. R. 10677. An act for the relief of Quincy R. Craft.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

S. 1911. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916;

S. 2014. An act to provide for the settlement of small holding claims on unsurveyed land in the State of New Mexico;

H. R. 9981. An act making appropriations for the Executive and for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 173. Joint resolution authorizing the President to appoint a special mission of friendship, good will, and congratulation to represent the Government and people of the United States at the centennial celebration of the independence of Brazil.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate resolutions adopted by the Maui Chamber of Commerce, of Wailuku, County of Maui, Hawaiian Territory, protesting against the enactment of legislation to transfer jurisdiction over railroad, telegraph, and telephone companies in the Territory of Hawaii from the Interstate Commerce Commission to the Territorial Public Utilities Commission, which was referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Possessions.

Mr. KEYES presented a resolution of the board of directors of the Portsmouth (N. H.) Chamber of Commerce, protesting against the adoption of the so-called St. Lawrence power and canal project until all available information determining its relative national and local value has been secured, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. WILLIS presented petitions of sundry citizens of Holgate, Napoleon, New Bavaria, Defiance, and Hamler, all in the State of Ohio, praying for the imposition in the pending tariff bill of a duty of \$2 per 100 pounds on Cuban sugar, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Lebanon, Ohio, praying for the imposition in the pending tariff bill of only a moderate duty on cotton gloves, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

NAVAL APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I ask unanimous consent out of order to report with amendments from the Committee on Appropriations the bill (H. R. 11228) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 762) thereon.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Will the Senator from Washington state when he intends to ask the Senate to consider the bill?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I expect to ask to have the bill taken up on Monday next.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The Senator will ask that the bill may be taken up in the morning hour?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Yes; if it is agreeable, as I understand it is, to the chairman of the Committee on Finance, and if it is agreeable to the Senate, I shall ask to have it taken up then.

Mr. KING. I should like to say to the Senator from Washington that some of us who are on the Committee on Naval Affairs in name know nothing of this bill. We have not had an opportunity, of course, under the new rule to learn what has been going on or to help frame the bill. We have had no voice in its formulation. Obviously there must have been some testimony taken by the subcommittee which framed the bill, in addition to the testimony which was taken in the House of Representatives. I ask the Senator not to press the consideration of the bill on Monday. I suggest that he wait until Wednesday before calling up the bill, in order to give us a chance to procure the testimony and familiarize ourselves with the record. I wish to say to the Senator that if the bill contains some features which I think it does, there will be some opposition to it.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I myself regret that the Naval Affairs Committee did not have jurisdiction to act upon this bill, but I am not responsible for that.

Mr. KING. The Senator from Utah acquits the Senator from Washington, of course, of any responsibility.

Mr. POINDEXTER. That was due to a rule adopted by the Senate, and, of course, we have to comply with that rule. I would have been very glad if the Senator from Utah had been a member of the Appropriations Committee to which the bill was referred. I will say to the Senator that the report which I am presenting now is, with very few minor exceptions, the same as the report of the subcommittee, a printed copy of which I handed to the Senator several days ago.

Mr. KING. The Senator did me the kindness and courtesy day before yesterday to hand me a confidential report, which I am free to say, with the press of business here, I have had no opportunity to examine as yet. Of course, I can infract the Sabbath to-morrow and go through it, as I shall; but I think it would be better if the Senator would give us a little time.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Of course, the Senator realizes the limited time between now and the beginning of the next fiscal year, and also the fact that the bill will have to go to conference after it shall have passed the Senate. I trust the Senator will allow us to take it up, with the understanding that, if there are special matters as to which the Senator desires further information as we proceed with the bill, I shall be very glad to pass them over so as to give the Senator from Utah an opportunity further to examine them.

Mr. KING. Of course, I have no right, probably, to interpose my views in opposition to the views of the committee which have reported the bill; but I suggest to the Senator that it is a bill of considerable importance, involving hundreds of millions of dollars, that there are a number of items in the bill of much importance, according to my view, and it would be better if we should not undertake the consideration of the bill until we are ready. Speaking for myself, I shall be ready on Wednesday to go on with the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

BILL INTRODUCED.

Mr. SPENCER introduced a bill (S. 3700) to establish a bureau for the study of criminal, pauper, and defective classes, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

TARIFF BILL AMENDMENTS.

Mr. GOODING (for Mr. HARRELD) submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by Mr. HARRELD to House bill 7456, the tariff bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RIVER AND HARBOR BILL.

Mr. STERLING submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 10766) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed, as follows:

On page 17, line 14, strike out the words "Sioux City, Iowa," and insert the words "Chamberlain, S. Dak."

AMENDMENT TO NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. STERLING submitted an amendment providing that the naval appropriation act approved June 4, 1920, be amended so that any chaplain in the Naval Reserve Force who was more than 50 years of age on the date of said act and who now holds the confirmed rank of commander may be transferred to and appointed in the same permanent grade and rank in the regular Navy not in the line of promotion and not eligible for retirement, etc., intended to be proposed by him to House bill 11228, the Navy Department appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, announced that on June 10, 1922, the President approved and signed the following acts:

S. 745. An act to amend section 24 and section 256 of the Judicial Code; and

S. 2775. An act to extend for one year the powers of the War Finance Corporation to make advances under the provisions of the act entitled "An act to amend the War Finance Corporation act, approved April 5, 1918, as amended, to provide relief for producers of and dealers in agricultural products, and for other purposes," approved August 24, 1921.

FOREIGN DEPOSITARIES OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 7) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to designate depositaries of public moneys in foreign countries and in the Territories and insular possessions of the United States, which was, on page 1, line 8, after "prescribe," to insert:

Provided, That in designating such depositaries American financial institutions shall be given preference wherever, in the judgment of the Secretary of the Treasury, such institution is safe and able to render the service required.

Mr. McLEAN. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

ED THOMAS AND PAULINE THOMAS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2666) for the relief of Ed Thomas and Pauline Thomas, which was, on page 1, line 4, to strike out "pay" and insert "pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated."

Mr. BROUSSARD. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives.

The motion was agreed to.

JESSE GOODIN.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2664) for the relief of Jesse Goodin, which was, on page 1, line 4, to strike out "pay" and insert "pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated."

Mr. BROUSSARD. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives.

The motion was agreed to.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The following bills were severally read twice by title and referred as indicated below:

H. R. 211. An act to extend the provisions of the pension act of May 11, 1912, and May 1, 1920, to the officers and enlisted men of all State militia and other State organizations that rendered service to the Union cause during the Civil War for a period of 90 days or more, and providing pensions for their widows, minor children, and dependent parents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 10675. An act for the relief of Henry McGuire; and
H. R. 10677. An act for the relief of Quincy R. Craft; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H. R. 9626. An act granting a deed of quitclaim and release to the Traders' Brokerage Co., a corporation, of certain lands in the city of Pensacola, Fla.;

H. R. 9746. An act for the relief of Emmett Otto Cooney; and
H. R. 10419. An act validating certain applications for and entries of public lands; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

H. R. 3836. An act for the relief of Nolan P. Benner;
H. R. 6926. An act for the relief of Abraham Leibovitz;
H. R. 8214. An act to compensate the owners of the American steamship *Vindal* for damages and expenses in repairing the said steamship, and to make an appropriation therefor;
H. R. 8264. An act for the relief of Thomas B. Smith;
H. R. 8448. An act for the relief of Joseph Zitek; and
H. R. 10234. An act for the relief of Edward A. Purdy; to the Committee on Claims.

PRICES OF COAL.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, in the regular RECORD type, Secretary Hoover's remarks before the coal operators on Wednesday, May 31, 1922, together with certain statements and tables in reference to the coal situation.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD in 8-point type, as follows:

SECRETARY HOOVER'S REMARKS BEFORE COAL OPERATORS, WEDNESDAY, MAY 31, 1922, IN THE AUDITORIUM, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT, WASHINGTON, D. C.

A conference of coal producers convened at 10 o'clock a. m., pursuant to call issued by the Secretary of Commerce.

The SECRETARY OF COMMERCE (Mr. Hoover). Gentlemen, I have been asked by the President to call this conference for the purpose of consultation with you as to what measures we can properly take to restrain runaway prices, profiteering, and speculation in coal during the present coal strike.

This is not to be a discussion of the strike nor of wage questions, but purely a discussion between the Secretary of Commerce and the producing operators upon the sole question of price and distribution of coal.

You are aware of the facts in the present situation as well as I. At the present moment bituminous coal is being produced at the rate, approximately, of 5,000,000 tons a week. Consumption is somewhere from eight million to eight and one-half million tons a week. We are drawing upon stocks at the rate of three million to three and a half million tons a week. Production will probably increase slightly as time goes on.

But the time has arrived when those unwise virgins who did not accept the recommendations I repeatedly made as to stocking themselves with coal find themselves compelled to go into the market. Distribution is greatly disturbed from its normal channels. There is a tendency to multiply bidding from the public and thus to force up the price of coal against itself.

On the last occasion when there was disturbance in the coal production prices rose at some mines from a range from \$6 to as high as \$10 and \$12 and even \$15 a ton for spot coal at the mine, and all holders of coal raised their prices accordingly. Such a condition represents a loss on spot coal to the public running into the millions of dollars a week. It gives to the industry a color of profiteering; and it is my distinct recollection of that period that the charge given the operator was not only laid against many unjustly but that the vast majority of operators considered that in its reactions it was the most disastrous of the things that had happened to him. [Applause.]

It is utterly impossible for each operator to act alone. Many hundreds of operators during that occasion held to their price list, despite the offers that were made to them and despite the fact that coal which they placed on board cars at a comparatively low price was sold under their eyes at double and treble the price at which they had turned it out. I had felt that before such an occasion arises again it was desirable that we take such steps as we can take to prevent its recurrence.

A week ago I called a preliminary conference of some 30 or 40 coal operators to determine what steps might be taken, in their view, and to test out the disposition of producing operators in this matter. Those gentlemen were unanimous and emphatic in an expression of the necessity that restraint of some kind should be placed upon the existing situation, not only in the interest of the public but in the interest of the operators, and the fundamental interest of the whole industry. Upon their suggestion the President directed me to call this larger conference.

The result of the last conference a week ago has been to put a check on the daily rise in price that was in process, and prices

have receded from 50 cents to a dollar a ton nearly throughout the country. Prices to-day vary somewhere from \$2.50 to \$3.50 a ton at the mines in most districts, although there are one or two districts that are still over the \$4 level.

What we are interested in, what the public is interested in, is not the question of cents, it is the question of dollars. With the unrestrained operation of the law of supply and demand in a situation of this kind the price of spot coal might easily be carried to \$12 or \$15 a ton at the mine; and any such situation as that, I believe you will agree with me, must be prevented if we can. [Applause.]

I have some little knowledge, perhaps, of the situation in the coal industry as it has existed during the past 12 months. I am fully aware that the industry as a whole has operated without profit, and perhaps even at a loss; that prices to the public have been unduly low so far as the mine operator is concerned; that differences in price of 10 cents or 15 cents or 20 cents a ton make the difference between profit and loss in coal production. The public does not realize, I believe, that these are the margins for which the operator must contend. [Applause.]

With high freight rates, with high cost of retail distribution, the public has little appreciation of the secondary part that prices at the mines play in the ultimate cost to the individual of coal put in his cellar. Nevertheless, the operator has, in the public mind, the primary responsibility for the price of coal, and it is with a view to summoning that responsibility, in the public interest and in the interest of the industry, that we are meeting here at this moment.

There are some things that the public should understand in respect of this problem:

(1) That it is a problem of the most stupendous difficulty; that it is easy to denounce profiteering; in fact, it is the favorite sport. [Laughter and applause.]

(2) That the vast majority of the coal operators, out of their own interest and out of their sense of public interest, do not wish profiteering in coal. [Applause.]

(3) That where profiteering begins and ends is not a question of demagogic statement; it is a question as to a definite fair price. There is no use of arguing theories when it comes to determine what must be done in a practical world, but it becomes a problem of determining the actual basis upon which fair transactions should take place if actual constructive work is to be done in the situation.

(4) What a fair price may be depends upon conditions in each district and varies not only with each district but with different mines in each district.

(5) That the majority of the coal is sold on contracts established before the strike and that price fluctuation refers only to spot or free coal.

(6) The public should understand that there is not a shred of law or authority to either determine or enforce a fair price; that there is not a single shred of law on the statute books of the United States Government in prevention of profiteering or anything of that character.

(7) That the law itself prohibits coal operators agreeing among themselves as to what a fair price would be, even if the operators should place that fair price below cost of production. We may as well face the fact that a combination in the public interest is just as illegal as one against the public interest. Without entering into the merits or demerits of the local situation that is the actual case.

In times like these, in emergencies of this character, some one has got to take the responsibility, some one must take the leadership and say what is fair. I do not believe that men deserve to hold public office unless they are prepared to accept the responsibilities that arise in emergencies. [Applause, loud and prolonged.]

I therefore am not going to shirk this responsibility by asking you to enter into any agreement or combination amongst yourselves to restrain trade or prices or to do anything else that is wrong in law, whether it is in the public benefit or not. I propose to inquire, with your cooperation, as to the situation in the various districts; I propose to consult with you and to cooperate with you; I am going to take the responsibility upon my own back of saying what is fair, and I am going to ask every individual operator as a public service to adhere to such basis in his district, and that is to be a moral agreement between him and me. [Applause.]

If he should fail to keep that agreement it will be between himself and his conscience. I may have remarks to make about it, but I have no power to enforce it.

I have no desire to assume unnecessary responsibilities, responsibilities that are bound to carry unusual loads of criticism; but there is a question here of protecting the public from losses that might aggregate \$15,000,000 or \$25,000,000 a week; aye,

there is even a greater responsibility than that, and that is to save the business men of the United States from undeserved criticism by reason of being thrust in a position that they can not themselves alone prevent. [Applause.]

There is no question in mind as to the high sense of public service among the business men of the United States; that they want above all things not only to maintain but to demonstrate their right to esteem in the community, and I would be a failure as Secretary of Commerce if in representing these men I did not give opportunity to make such demonstration and to offer such public service. I am, therefore, suggesting to you a cooperation between each of you individually and the Secretary of Commerce. [Applause.]

Last week we prepared, after considerable discussion, a preliminary plan, a plan that I have no doubt would have been effective. That plan, however, has been criticized in that it might contain elements of restraint of trade by coordinate action between ourselves. I will not ask you to enter into any plan that might be subject to that suspicion, even though it be in public interest. The plan proposed then would be more effective than that which I now have to propose. The plan I propose here depends solely upon moral forces and good will.

It becomes necessary, then, that I should propose to you for discussion some alternative to that plan that will free it absolutely from any taint of suspicion or criticism as a conspiracy in law to restrain trade. In doing so I would like to make the emphatic statement to the public that the administration is here seeking cooperation of each individual coal operator in the public interest; that if such cooperation fails it will not be a failure of the administrative officials. I am confident that the vast majority will adhere to the plan proposed. If it will not work in a minority, it will be a failure in authority of administrative officials.

But I do not believe we will fail; in fact, I believe that here will be offered an opportunity to the business men to demonstrate that moral forces can be established that will prove that the arm of the law is unnecessary in the matter of protection of the public interest. [Applause.]

Now, gentlemen, we are all busy people, and I would like to make one or two propositions to you for your views.

(1) That the Garfield prices for run-of-mine coal should be the basis for computing sales prices, with such adjustments as are necessary to include the wholesale selling costs, changed conditions at the mines, and other factors that will be fair to the public and to the operators and will maintain production of coal. Any agreement to adhere to this is a moral agreement between each individual operator and myself.

I know that there is some objection, and some rightful objection, to using the Garfield prices as a base. On the other hand, we have no time, we have no machinery, for determining what is detailed right or wrong in the matter of price. The Garfield prices were the result of experience extending over a considerable period of time and an elaborate series of investigation, and it is much more easy; it is much more facile and much more practical to say broadly what are the necessary changes to be made in such basis than to go out and endeavor to establish a new base at this moment.

We know, approximately at least, the changes in wage levels. We know, approximately, those districts where the Garfield prices proved to be unfair. We know the changes that were proposed by the old Fuel Administration in those prices had that work continued. We know that a large proportion of the coal is sold on contract at prices below the Garfield levels. We know that this problem is a problem of spot coal alone. We know many of the factors that have entered into the question. The public is not interested in the question of cents, the public is interested in the question of dollars. Therefore, my feeling is that we can arrive quickly at some notion of a fair price which I can state after discussion with you as to these changed conditions, whereas otherwise we would be at sea for weeks.

(2) My suggestion is that each district should to-day nominate to the Secretary of Commerce a committee of the district to advise with him as to the conditions that bear upon the Garfield level and upon which I may form some judgment as to a fair price for the district.

(3) After we have made this primary determination these committees should continue and should report to me any unfair prices in their respective districts, and should act on my behalf and as I may direct them to do in individual cases that may arise in their respective districts.

In other words, the latter part of the machinery is altered to the extent that I wish to appoint a committee in each district to represent me purely in the capacity of a moral force in securing a fair price that I must take the responsibility of stating after I shall have learned as well as I can the conditions in each district.

The whole of this is purely a temporary expedient during this strike. I do not know how long the situation will last; it may be months, for all that I know.

I should have been glad to have proposed to you machinery that would have relieved me of this major responsibility, of machinery that would be absolute; but I can not do so without imposing upon you certain responsibilities and risks that I have no right to ask you to take.

I do not ask you to vote or take any collective responsibility on this proposition. I wish your individual views. This is a transaction between me and each individual operator. If anybody is to be called into question for this agreement, it is I alone, and I will stand it.

I shall be better able to judge the situation when I have had your views.

I will now call on some of those present for discussion. I would like to call upon all of you, but it happens I do not enjoy your personal acquaintance and therefore I may not call upon some who will be able to give us valuable suggestions. I first call upon Mr. Ogle, the president of the National Coal Association. [Applause.]

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, June 8, 1922.

HOMER D. JONES,

*President National Retail Merchants' Association,
2623 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.*

DEAR SIR: I am in receipt of your letter of June 6, which shows a good deal of misunderstanding of the situation.

Your letter gives the impression that the householder should be informed by me that retailers are warranted in advancing the price of coal by \$1.75 per ton as the result of negotiations by the administration with the operators, and in support of this you make certain statements to which I can not agree.

First. You give the impression that spot smokeless coal for household purposes was selling at \$1.75 prior to the strike, and that at \$3.50 maximum for run of mine he is burdened with an advance of \$1.75.

From the quotations you append to your letter the price of "run of mine" and slack (steam coals) prior to the strike was \$1.75 to \$2, but from the very quotations you give me it is evident that lump (which is the householders' main interest) the prices prior to the strike were \$3 to \$3.25, and not \$1.75 as might be inferred.

Under the request I have made to the operators that they should adhere to the Garfield scales, plus such alteration as changes in production costs warrants, and that in the case of smokeless operators should not exceed \$3.50 run of mine and \$3.75 for lump, you will see that those who are justified in asking the maximum would have advanced lump over even pre-strike prices by 50 to 75 cents per ton, and not \$1.75. In other words, you have ignored the great decrease of differential in favor of the householder that has been suggested by me to the operators.

Second. Your letter seeks to give the impression that there was a rise of \$1.75 per ton in smokeless after my statement of June 1. You are well aware that the prices of coal generally reached their peak above this on May 15, before I first became active. To-day smokeless lump exceeds your quotation for pre-strike by about 25 cents.

Third. I am glad to note your statement confirming the fact that retailers have large stocks of pre-strike coal. My recommendation to the retailers was that in public interest and the interest of the coal trade the retailers should reserve their pre-strike coal or their contract coal, which they obtained at pre-strike prices, and much of which came from the districts of shorter rail haul, and therefore lower cost for the smaller householders, and that it should, of course, be sold at actual cost, plus a fair handling charge, and that any coal bought at strike prices should be sold to the larger consumers likewise at cost and fair handling charge. As you will see, the increases since the strike are largely for run of mine, and therefore for steam coal.

In reply to the statement of your association at our conference that it was necessary for the retailer to sell his coal at replacement cost, thus advancing all pre-strike coal to strike coal prices even from longer-haul districts, I stated that I thought it would be very unfair to the consumer and would constitute at least moral profiteering.

Fourth. I would again call your attention to the fact that you misquoted the statements issued here when you say that the price of coal has been fixed at \$3.50 per ton. There has been no price fixed for coal. The operators were requested by me:

To cooperate with me in carrying out my proposal "that Garfield prices for run-of-mine coal should be the basis for

computing sales prices, with such adjustments as are necessary to include the wholesale selling costs, changed conditions at the mines, and other factors that will be fair to the public and to the operators and will maintain production of coal. Any agreement to adhere to this is a moral agreement between each operator and myself.

Further than this, I have expressed the view with regard to the Alabama fields, in following the above, the changes in conditions did not warrant a price in excess of 25 cents under the Garfield scale, and that in the smokeless fields they did not warrant a price in excess of \$3.50 for run of mine, with a differential of 25 cents for lump instead of the prestrike differential of 75 cents to \$1. Many operators having low costs are upon this formula selling considerably below this maximum for spot coal. I note that you ignore the whole question of a just price to the mines upon which production can continue.

Fifth. I note that you state:

"Our association is opposed in principle and as a matter of sound business to governmental policy, official or unofficial, or to legal control of the coal business, whether with respect to production or distribution."

I assume I am to take from this that your association does not wish to cooperate in the prevention of profiteering in this time of emergency. I notice there is an entire change of sentiment from that expressed at our conference at this office, when you strongly urged that a restraint in price was necessary in the public interest, and that you considered the action taken by the administration had prevented a runaway market. I can not believe that the change of views which you here evidence at all represents the vast majority of retail coal dealers in the country, because in their intimate contact with the needs of the householder I have found from inquiry that in the great majority of places they have made no attempt to secure unusual profits—that they are making every effort to supply their customers and to charge them simply the cost of their stocks of coal or their contracts for coal plus a reasonable handling charge.

Sixth. It does seem to me that the retail coal dealers could play a fine part in this emergency if they would follow this suggestion:

(a) All coal to be sold at cost plus a reasonable handling charge.

(b) The cheap prestrike and contract coal to be reserved for the smaller household trade.

(c) Steam and larger domestic consumers to be supplied from current purchases plus a reasonable handling charge.

(d) Cooperate to prevent rising mine prices, for some districts are refusing to accept the formula I have outlined above and are asking \$5 per ton.

(e) Handle coal on straight lines from operator and wholesaler without speculative resales in the trade.

By such cooperation I feel sure we can save the public from runaway prices such as we witnessed in 1920, thus saving to them several dollars per ton—of more interest than questions of 25 cents or 50 cents.

Yours faithfully,

HERBERT HOOVER.

Statement of average prices spot market—bituminous coal.

(In cents per net ton.)

Date.	Smokeless low volatile, Chicago, f. o. b. mine.		West Virginia high volatile, Cincinnati, f. o. b. mine.		Southeast Kentucky, Cincinnati, f. o. b. mine.		Pool No. 9, low volatile, New York, run of mine, steam sizes, f. o. b. mine.	Smokeless Hampton Roads, run of mine steam sizes, f. o. b. vessel.
	Lump, household sizes.	Run of mine, steam sizes.	Splint lump, household sizes.	Run of mine, steam sizes.	Lump, household sizes.	Run of mine, steam sizes.		
February 27.....	315	215	225	140	235	175	240	460
March 6.....	315	200	225	135	225	140	250	465
March 13.....	315	185	250	135	225	135	240	460
March 20.....	315	185	215	140	210	145	230	455
March 27.....	270	160	215	135	210	130	225	455
April 3.....	260	170	215	145	210	140	225	455
April 10.....	240	175	200	155	190	160	240	460
April 17.....	250	165	200	190	215	190	325	475
April 24.....	230	180	265	195	240	200	325	480
May 1.....	275	195	275	240	290	240	325	530
May 8.....	290	225	250	250	260	260	350	565
May 15.....	290	270	310	300	300	300	400	675
May 22.....	275	275	340	340	350	350	475	735
May 29.....	340	315	340	310	330	315	380	615
June 5.....	315	290	325	275	325	285	390	610

¹Includes freight rate and dumping charges.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, June 5, 1922.

The PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit the following statement in response to Senate Resolution 298, which reached me this morning.

I should state that there is no consequential recruiting of statistics by the Government from original sources. The Government departments, except for some special occasions, are dependent upon voluntary contributions of data from the trade and transportation associations. Upon this information the following estimates have been compiled. For convenience the questions enumerated in the resolution are repeated here.

1. "The present supply of mined bituminous coal."

The latest information we have is a canvass of the situation at the opening of the strike on April 1 by the Department of Commerce and the Geological Survey, partly depending upon various trade associations. No funds have been available for the repetition of this inquiry.

On April 1 the stocks of mined bituminous coal in the hands of consumers were estimated at 63,000,000 tons. In addition thereto there was estimated to be 4,000,000 tons on the Lake Superior and Michigan docks and about 2,500,000 either on tracks or in storage belonging to the operators. There was also an unknown amount of coal in transit on the railways. A guess has been made that it amounts to between 10,000,000 and 15,000,000 tons.

2. "The average weekly production and consumption of such coal since April 1, 1922."

The only statistics as to production are the daily number of cars loaded and are furnished by the railways, as follows:

Week ending—	Cars.	Estimated tons.
April 8.....	66,182	3,825,000
April 15.....	65,522	3,656,000
April 22.....	60,228	3,575,000
April 29.....	71,574	4,175,000
May 6.....	73,158	4,164,000
May 13.....	78,090	4,433,000
May 20.....	79,178	4,484,000
May 27.....	85,982	4,856,000
June 3.....	82,185	4,600,000
Total.....	661,097	37,768,000

There are no statistics of consumption. A rough estimate may be deduced by assuming the consumption to be equal to production, based upon car loadings in other periods.

Week ending—	1919	1920	1921
April 9.....	6,224,350	8,461,450	5,684,750
April 16.....	6,673,300	6,885,000	6,085,600
April 23.....	6,606,250	7,620,700	6,303,150
April 30.....	7,371,750	7,985,550	6,512,850
May 7.....	7,627,300	8,205,150	6,901,600
May 14.....	7,756,900	7,845,200	7,482,250
May 21.....	7,838,300	8,197,300	7,461,900
May 28.....	7,157,550	8,449,150	7,630,050
June 4.....	8,011,850	8,057,000	6,306,650
Total.....	65,267,550	71,707,500	60,488,800
Average.....	7,251,950	7,967,500	6,407,330

As there has been considerable industrial recovery from the situation of 1921 and less activity than 1920, our rough guess is that the total consumption from April 1 to June 4 is about 65,000,000 tons. Upon that data the stocks of mined bituminous coal remaining on hand week ending June 4 should be about 32,000,000 tons, and in addition the amount of coal in transit may amount to 10,000,000 tons.

3. "The amount of bituminous coal estimated to be necessary for all uses in the United States until May 1, 1923."

The following tables show the estimated production of bituminous coal based on car loadings during the previous years for this period of 11 months and furnish a probable guide to the future:

	Tons.
From June 1, 1919, to May 1, 1920.....	455,221,000
From June 1, 1920, to May 1, 1921.....	472,995,000

4. "The effect of such strike upon present coal prices and the probable effect upon such prices if a settlement of that strike is not reached before September 1, 1922."

First, as to present coal prices:

Coal is sold (a) by long-term contracts and (b) uncontracted coal for spot delivery. The proportion of the present production of bituminous coal on old contracts is variously estimated at from three-eighths to three-fourths of the production, and, of course, varies with each mine. The prices on old contracts are undisturbed by the strike. Spot coal receives the full impact of the new demand. The prices of spot coal prior to the strike and since vary with each district and each mine.

Various causes connected with the general business depression, the collapse of the export trade in coal, the competition of nonunion operators endeavoring to build up and maintain their organizations and production in anticipation of better prices in the event of the strike, the general pressure to give employment during the winter, appear to have caused the coal from southern districts—those now operating—to be sold at the cost of production or even at a loss for some months before the strike. After the strike mine prices rose steadily to as high as \$5 and \$6 in some instances, although the general range was somewhat below these levels.

Furthermore, owing to the necessity of present production being carried longer distances by rail to reach consumers formerly served by nearer fields the price levels in such localities for coal are much affected by increased freight charges.

It was deemed necessary to use the influence of the administration to halt the rise of prices and if possible prevent a repetition of the price panic of 1920 when spot mine prices rose to as high as \$12 per ton. As a result of the activities undertaken the rise in prices has halted and has even receded in some districts in various amounts from 50 cents to \$2 per ton. These activities of the administration are set out under paragraph 6.

As to what the course of prices may be, I am unable to state. I am in hopes the actions taken may save the public from a recurrence of such profiteering as developed on previous occasions.

5. "What action, if any, has been taken in the United States through its governmental agencies to terminate the strike?"

The governmental agencies have no legal authority to terminate or intervene in the strike. Quite informally and repeatedly suggestions as to propositions on which the disputants might well confer and hope for settlement have been made through the Department of Labor and this department, or both, but thus far these suggestions have been without result.

6. "What action, if any, has been taken by the United States to protect the consumers of coal from paying exorbitant prices by reason of curtailment of production?"

The administrative agencies possess no authority of law to protect the consumers or no appropriations available for the conduct of informal action. As a tender of good offices of the governmental agencies, various conferences have been held with consumers, dealers, and operators where it is sought to impress upon them the necessity for prices that would be fair in the interest of the public.

No generalizations upon profiteering are of any value to the public. In a shortage the only effectual action must be a statement of a fair price for dealing. Any such price must take into account the maintenance of production and, therefore, the costs of the mines the most expensive to operate.

In making such suggestions I have proposed "that the last Garfield prices for run-of-mine coal should be the basis for computing sales prices, with such adjustments as are necessary to include the wholesale selling costs, changed conditions at the mines, and other factors that will be fair to the public and to the operators and will maintain production of coal. Any agreement to adhere to this is a moral agreement between each individual operator and myself."

The Garfield scales (United States Fuel Administration) were the result of exhaustive investigations of the Fuel Administration and the Federal Trade Commission into working costs, profits, etc., during the war, and were generally considered as just.

The opinions of the directors of the Bureau of Mines and the Geological Survey have been availed of as to changes in conditions since those scales were settled and further inquiries upon specific points have been made of the operators and those familiar with different districts. The selling commissions set out separately in the Garfield scales were added to the mine figures. The maximum prices thought fair in certain districts are set out below. Some operators of specially low-cost mines have agreed to hold to lower prices. Certain operators and certain districts have refused to accept the suggestions made chiefly because the Garfield scales included contract coal, the losses on which below the Garfield scale they believe should be covered by equalizing increases in the spot-coal prices regard-

less of costs or profits. Numerous conferences are in progress, and I hope cooperation will be secured in all districts and between all branches of the trade.

These proceedings obviously have no force in law, and furthermore any collective agreements or any erection of committees in the trades for enforcement might be criticized as a violation of the law even were the result to public benefit. Therefore, the entire part of the administration is confined to statement of opinion of the administration of what is fair, with the hope it may be adhered to by each individual. The result so far has been to halt the rise and to secure considerable reductions in certain cases.

The attached statements have been issued.

I beg to remain,

Yours faithfully,

HERBERT HOOVER.

ALABAMA DISTRICT.

MAY 31, 1922.

In the Alabama field the costs of coal production have been reduced since the final Garfield scales were determined.

After having consulted the Alabama operators and being assured of their cooperation I have concluded that a maximum fair price for spot coal from the district should be 25 cents per ton below the final Garfield scale, the operators to absorb out of this price a reasonable selling expense.

The operators wish it clearly understood that this is the maximum fair price and that anyone may sell below it and that long contracts for coal are necessarily below these levels.

The Garfield scale varies from \$2.45 to \$2.85 for the bulk of run-of-mine coal from the district and, therefore, these coals will be a maximum of \$2.20 to \$2.60. There is some production from thin seams, and where the Garfield scale is higher these will also be subject to the 25-cent reduction. The differentials of the Garfield scale up and down for washed and prepared coals and screenings will be taken as a fair basis.

The Alabama field is not running full capacity, due to the lack of orders, and production can be increased 50,000 to 100,000 tons per week. Therefore, consumers in the southeastern States, together with those accessible to water-borne coal in the south Atlantic and Gulf seaboard, together with inland markets as far as St. Louis and Kansas City, would be well advised to take this opportunity of securing supplies.

POCAHONTAS, NEW RIVER, TUG RIVER, AND WINDING GULF FIELDS.

MAY 31, 1922.

After having consulted the operators in the Pocahontas, New River, Tug River, and Winding Gulf fields—smokeless coal districts of West Virginia—and having been assured of the cooperation of 80 per cent of the production here represented, and having the approval of the Director of the Geological Survey and the Acting Director of the Bureau of Mines, I have concluded that \$3.50 per ton is a fair maximum price for spot run-of-mine coal for these fields, the operators absorbing in these prices a reasonable selling expense, the prices for prepared and slack coal to bear a differential up and down equal to the Garfield scales.

The last Garfield prices for the district, including the selling commission for run of mine, varied from \$2.50 to \$3 per ton for domestic coal, with a price of \$3.85 to \$4.35 per ton on export and bunker coal, which comprise a considerable portion of the production. The costs of production in the district have increased since the Garfield scale, and that scale included contract coal which now sells below the maximum.

I therefore hope the above flat price will be accepted as a fair maximum.

Considerable coal has piled up at seaboard from these districts, and the public would be well advised to secure this coal.

HARLAN, HAZARD, AND SOUTHERN APPALACHIAN FIELDS.

MAY 31, 1922.

Having consulted the operators in the Harlan and Hazard fields of Kentucky and the Southern Appalachian fields of Tennessee and Kentucky, and having been assured of the cooperation of about 80 per cent of the present production and having the approval of the Director of the Geological Survey and the Acting Director of the Bureau of Mines, I have concluded that \$3.50 per ton is a fair maximum price for spot run-of-mine coal for these fields, the operators absorbing at these prices a reasonable selling expense, the price for prepared coal and slack to bear a differential up and down equal to the Garfield scale.

The last Garfield prices in this district—except for some low cost and special high cost mines—ranged from about \$3 to \$3.25 for run of mine, including selling commission. The costs have increased some since the Garfield scale, and that scale included contract coal which now sells below this maximum. I therefore hope the above flat price will be accepted as a fair maximum.

FRIDAY, JUNE 2, 1922.

Secretary Hoover announced last night:

"I believe that the whole of the coal districts in Virginia, West Virginia, Tennessee, and east Kentucky will accept the fair maximum of \$3.50 per ton for run-of-mine spot coal. The Alabama field accepts the lower scale, as previously announced. The operators in the west Kentucky fields do not feel that they can agree to a lower price than \$4.25. I have not felt that I could recommend this price to the consuming public, and the matter is therefore under further consideration. They feel that their costs have increased materially beyond the increases in other fields. On the other hand, my present feeling is that they should, in the general interest, adhere to the maximum accepted by the majority of the operators in other fields. A discussion of the Pennsylvania fields will be taken up later in the week. We have not yet dealt with problems west of the Mississippi River.

"It should be understood that the whole object of the administration's interest in coal prices is to protect the consumer by indicating the maximum price that would be fair for spot coal during the temporary period of the strike, and by doing so to protect that great group of operators who do not wish to take advantage of the present situation.

"Out of the 5,000,000 tons of weekly production of bituminous coal, probably three and a half million tons are under long-term contracts to consumers at prices stipulated in the contracts, and there can be no alteration of these contract prices, which as a rule run considerably below prices for spot coal, as they represent a steady business to the mines. The suggestion of a maximum fair price relates solely to spot coal. Many coal dealers enjoy long-time contracts at lower rates, and it would be only fair to the public that in the resale of this contract coal these dealers should give the customer the full benefit of their lower prices; and I feel sure from my discussions with them that the majority will do so.

"In order to prevent the resale of coal for speculative purposes it is most desirable in the interest of the consumer, operator, and wholesaler that the operators and dealers should insist upon knowing that purchases are on behalf of a definite consumer.

"The maximum price for spot coal is not the minimum price. It is only a general figure that will protect the public from such occasions as the last pinch, when spot coal in many places went to over \$10 per ton. In arriving at the figure the Garfield scales were taken as a basis, as these scales were the result of close investigations during the war, and allowances have been made for increased costs and a general average of the situation taken that would protect the public and maintain production. The maximum price includes customary selling commissions, which were established separately in the Garfield scale, and the operators are recommended to use the usual wholesale agencies, thus promoting direct movement to the consumer.

"In these circumstances some minor proportion of the mines will make considerable profits; some minor proportion of them will, under these circumstances, earn nothing; and in some cases of low-cost producing mines the operators have already notified their consumers that they will continue to supply them at lower rates than the maximum. What we are endeavoring to prevent is a panic in prices such as took place at the last coal pinch.

"Every consumer who is interested in knowing that he gets a square deal can easily check the freight rates, can compare them with the maximum price, can inquire from his dealer whether he is buying contract coal and at what rate, and can make proper allowances for retail distribution. If consumers are unwilling to take this degree of interest in negotiating for coal, it is a certainty that no one can help them. I believe the vast majority of operators, wholesalers, and retail dealers sincerely wish that this difficult occasion shall pass by without any rightful criticism of their conduct anywhere along the line. I regret that a small minority have refused to cooperate and are demanding higher prices. The Government has no authority in the matter, for this is purely a moral question and one of cooperation. The consumers who are not treated fairly may appeal to this department in Washington and their case will be inquired into."

[For release June 3, 1922.]

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
UNITED STATES GEOLOGICAL SURVEY,
Washington.

Director George Otis Smith, of the United States Geological Survey, said last night:

"After attending the conference which the Secretary of Commerce has had with the coal operators, as well as living with the coal question for weeks, I am fully convinced that the plan Secretary Hoover is engineering in the interest of the public holds a larger promise of keeping coal prices down than any other move that is feasible at this time.

"In simple terms of current coal production and consumption the present situation is loaded. Since April 1 our mines have put on the cars only about half as much coal as the country has burned. Fortunately, the output is slowly increasing, but no possible stocks of coal in storage can long stand this drain of 3,500,000 to 4,000,000 tons a week. Yet the complacent public sleeps, seemingly awaiting some explosion to arouse it to action. Such an effective alarm could come in the shape of a sudden jump in coal prices, but Mr. Hoover and the coal operators have not thought it safe to permit the past to be repeated, and they are agreed that the safety-first move is to put some definite limit on prices.

"A buyers' panic and a runaway market usually happen at the same time, and each aggravates the other. Consumers with foresight, especially the larger consumers, bought large supplies of coal while the buying was good, but others who were less wise did not stock up, and these "foolish virgins," as Secretary Hoover has called them, will be the first to find themselves short of fuel. Their plight is partly of their own making, and, to judge from the \$8 and \$10 spot prices for 1920, many of them, once awake to their need, will try to buy at any price.

"It is obvious that, with this condition of undersupply of many consumers, coal production needs to be stimulated, and a fair price to accomplish most must be a generous price. Furthermore, the Secretary's decision as to a limiting price had to be reached without delay. It was imperative that even the high-cost producer be encouraged to contribute his tonnage, and therefore a fair maximum price was established for as wide a territory as possible, and the coal operators were urged to speed up production. Tons mined are far more important to the country than cents saved.

"The buying public should keep in mind that the \$3.50, which is set up as a fair price for most of the coal fields south of the Ohio and Potomac, is a maximum price, and that it applies only to spot coal. More than half of the present output of these fields is still under contract, and, in view of the steadier business these contracts permit, the contract coal is normally delivered at much lower figures, and those who will insure themselves with new contracts can also get much better terms than this spot price.

"Moreover, the maximum fair price is set up as only a temporary measure to steady the nerves of what threatened to be a runaway market. It is hoped that this \$3.50 price will become only a mark to show where the 1922 price of coal was halted. A repetition of the \$8, \$9, and \$10 prices of 1920 is what Mr. Hoover is trying to avoid. The public should remember that two weeks ago, when the leading coal producers were first called to Washington, the price had begun to jump to \$4 and even higher. The appeal then made to the sellers of coal for cooperation fortunately met with a sympathetic response, for the coal industry knows better than the public the dangers of a runaway market to all concerned.

"With these facts before me, I question either the logic or the memory of whoever attacks this cooperative move, in which the representative of the public and the coal operators are joining."

TRIBUTE TO JEWISH RACE.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the *RECORD* in 8-point type a short article in the nature of an editorial which I recently wrote for the *Hebrew Standard*, entitled "Bigotry, the most senseless of evil forces."

Mr. McCUMBER. I could not hear the Senator's request, but I presume it has reference to the pending tariff bill?

Mr. ASHURST. It is in opposition to a propaganda that has been conducted and is now being conducted against the Jews, and I was asked to write a short editorial. I think it should go into the *RECORD*.

Mr. McCUMBER. I do not object to anything that will relieve the world of bigotry.

Mr. ASHURST. The article reflects on no person, race, or creed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the article will be printed in the RECORD.

The editorial referred to is as follows:

[From the Hebrew Standard.]

BIGOTRY MOST SENSELESS OF EVIL FORCES.

(By HENRY F. ASHURST, United States Senator, Arizona.)

Many years ago I was most favorably attracted by the power of penetration of the Jewish mind, and as time passed I grew more and more to admire the sterling qualities of the Jewish race. I wondered why the Jews possessed greater longevity than any other race, and I discovered that it was because of their freedom from vicious habits, their temperance, and their serenity of mind. As a boy I was amazed to find that the Jewish race, which has been so foolishly and so cruelly persecuted, had a civilization, a culture, and a code of laws before other races of men knew how to build fires with which to cook food. The Jews have contributed so much to our American experiment in free government that it would take many pages adequately to describe the importance and extent of their noble work here.

Of all the evil forces that assail the human heart, religious bigotry is the most senseless and the most absurd, yet we know that the Jews have suffered severely at the hands of bigots.

I believe, however, that the majority of American people look with severe disapproval upon any further discrimination against the Jewish race. During all of my public life and as a private citizen I have ever denounced bigotry, and you may depend that my views will never change in this respect.

THE TARIFF.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7456) to provide revenue, to regulate commerce with foreign countries, to encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I understand that we have passed over paragraph 376-A, "bismuth, $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent ad valorem."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ODDIE in the chair). That was passed over.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that we return to that paragraph.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the committee will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 85, line 6, it is proposed to insert the following:

PAR. 376a. Bismuth, $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent ad valorem.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, when this paragraph was up a few minutes ago I commented on the dearth of information with reference to it, and the Senator from North Dakota requested that it go over until the Senator from Utah could return to the Chamber and furnish fuller information than he was prepared to give the Senate. I find that there is a little information on this subject which may be of value to the Senate.

Bismuth, as we all know, is a salt that is very largely used for medicinal purposes. It is getting to be one of the common medicines of the people. What has struck me as very strange is the fact that in the case of most of the medicines that are in common use among the people that are now upon the free list the committee seems to have been disposed to transfer them to the dutiable list, or, where they are already subject to a moderate duty under the present law, to increase that duty greatly.

Under the present law this particular salt bears a duty of 10 per cent, and it is proposed in this bill—

Mr. KING. Under the present law it is free, as I understand.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator is talking about another matter entirely; not bismuth.

Mr. SIMMONS. I am talking about bismuth salts.

Mr. SMOOT. But we are not talking about the salts. This is bismuth.

Mr. SIMMONS. It is a salt, nevertheless. Bismuth is a medicine. That is what we are talking about. It is also used as a cosmetic. The Tariff Commission says:

The chief use of bismuth salts is in medicine and cosmetics.

This is bismuth. The bismuth that I know anything about is a salt. What is this bismuth that you are seeking here to protect?

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator is referring to mixtures of bismuth, found in paragraph 20, I suppose.

Mr. SIMMONS. That is what I am referring to.

Mr. SMOOT. Bismuth itself is on the free list under the existing law. That is the raw bismuth as it is taken out of the ore.

Mr. SIMMONS. What is the bismuth which you intend to protect? It is a new thing which you have put into the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. No; it is not; it is in the bill.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senate amendment is a new item. It does not appear in the bill as it passed the House at all.

Mr. SMOOT. I say to the Senator that it does appear in the bill as it passed the House, and if he will turn to paragraph 1523 he will find it.

Mr. SIMMONS. It does not appear at this point.

Mr. SMOOT. No; but the Senator said it did not appear in the bill.

Mr. SIMMONS. Then it appears somewhere else?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; if the Senator will turn to paragraph 1523, he will find that it is on the free list.

Mr. SIMMONS. And the committee put it on the dutiable list?

Mr. SMOOT. It is taken from the free list and put here at $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent ad valorem.

Mr. SIMMONS. Then the committee has taken it from the free list?

Mr. SMOOT. That is what I stated; but what the Senator was referring to was another matter. He referred to mixtures of bismuth, which fall under paragraph 20.

Mr. SIMMONS. What is the bismuth which the Senator wants to put on the free list? What is it used for? What is it made for? I mean bismuth which the Senator wants to take off the free list and put on the dutiable list.

Mr. SMOOT. It is used for automatic fire extinguishers, automatic fuses, and solders, and wherever there is a low fusible requirement. If the Senator really wants to know what it is he will find the information by turning to the tariff summary as to paragraph 1523.

Mr. SIMMONS. I asked for information before the Senator came in, because I had none as to this article. My only object in taking the floor was to find out what we are about to tax.

Mr. SMOOT. I will tell the Senator what we are about to tax. Bismuth has been on the free list; it was on the free list in the act of 1909. The tariff summary says of it:

Bismuth, one of the minor metals, is soft, reddish-white, and highly crystalline. It is a component of many easily fusible alloys which are used in manufacturing automatic fire sprinklers, electric fuses, and solders. Since it expands on solidifying from the molten state, it is used in some form of type and in metal bearings. The principal uses of bismuth, however, are in certain medicines and to some extent in the manufacture of cosmetics.

Those are the products manufactured from bismuth. I continue reading from the summary:

Production is about 300,000 pounds annually, practically all as a by-product from the smelting of lead, copper, gold, and silver ores in Utah.

We have had it up once before. If the Senator will look at the report, he will find that in 1918 it was valued at \$3 a pound, in 1919 it dropped to 97 cents a pound, in 1920 it rose to \$2.50 a pound—

Mr. SIMMONS. In this country?

Mr. SMOOT. No; that refers to the foreign country. In 1921 it fell to \$1.25 a pound. The testimony before the committee showed beyond a question of doubt that there was at least to-day about 20 to 25 per cent difference in the cost of recovery of bismuth in this country and in foreign countries. The ores carry a higher percentage of bismuth, and it is simply a matter of deciding the best thing to do. If they can not receive a certain price, about a dollar a pound, it is very much cheaper for the smelters to let it go off in the air, and not try to recover it at all. It is found in ores, as the report says, and if they recover it at all, there is an expense attached to the recovery in the smelting, and they have to receive about a dollar a pound to pay for that recovery.

Mr. SIMMONS. I want to ask the Senator if the expense to which he refers is not chiefly in the machinery which has to be installed for that purpose, and if aside from the cost of the machinery installed for the purpose, the cost of salvaging is not very cheap? I am not posted about this matter.

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator understood in detail the extraction of the different ores, particularly where they are mixed, he would know that it is quite expensive to get bismuth out, particularly when the article being recovered is a very small percentage of the ore itself, as is the case with bismuth. The Tariff Summary says:

This cost is in reality the cost of the last operation of recovery.

It is only a question as to whether we want to recover it from the ores in the United States or allow it to be imported, because of the fact that there is not very much of it used in the United States.

Mr. SIMMONS. If the Senator will pardon me, I think we can get these facts much better by colloquies than by speeches.

I understand now, from what the Senator says, that this is a by-product of the smelting of zinc and copper.

Mr. SMOOT. No; not copper; lead, generally.

Mr. SIMMONS. Zinc and lead?

Mr. SMOOT. It is generally found in lead ores.

Mr. SIMMONS. It is a by-product?

Mr. SMOOT. If you can call it a by-product; it is a part of the ore itself. If they did not recover it, if there were no recovery at all, the smelter would simply charge that much more for the smelting of the ore, and if they can not get out of it what it costs to recover it, certainly they will not try to recover it, and it will go off into the air or into the slag.

Mr. SIMMONS. My understanding is that we have about as fine deposits of lead in this country as they have elsewhere, and the data which has just been furnished me since the item was first taken up says that it is not only a by-product of lead but of copper, gold, and silver ores. I can not quite understand how the Senator could claim that there is less of this material in the copper, the gold, the lead, and the silver ores which we produce here than there is in like substances produced somewhere else.

Mr. SMOOT. That happens not only with manganese, but with magnesite and a great many other things. The ores of Spain are very high in lead. That often happens with products of the earth, particularly products of a mineral character.

Mr. SIMMONS. That might happen with one product, but that all our lead and copper and gold and silver ores have less of this material than like ores of other countries seems to me to be rather incredible. But I do not know as much about that as does the senior Senator from Utah or as the junior Senator from Utah. They live in a section of the country where mining is carried on; I do not. But I can not understand why there is this difference in the bismuth contents of these metals between this and other countries, in the first place; and in the second place, I can not understand why it would cost so much more to recover this material here in the process of smelting than elsewhere.

Mr. SMOOT. The rate proposed is only $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent ad valorem. In this connection I want to say to the Senator that the European syndicate controlled prices before the war, and during the war the United States established a market for this product, and the producers were virtually compelled to recover it in order to secure the amount necessary in the United States. It is a small industry. At no time have they produced over 300,000 pounds in the United States.

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes; and our consumption is about 300,000. We are producing now about as much as we consume.

Mr. SMOOT. No; we are not producing as much as we consume.

Mr. SIMMONS. About as much. If we recover 300,000 pounds and we consume 300,000, it seems to me it is not only about as much as we consume, but altogether as much as we consume.

Mr. SMOOT. We are not producing that amount now. Many of the smelters have been closed entirely.

Mr. SIMMONS. If the Senator will hear me, I want to say this—

Mr. SMOOT. I thought the Senator asked me to proceed; but I will yield the floor.

Mr. SIMMONS. I am anxious to carry on this colloquy with the Senator, because I think it is enlightening and is enabling us to get at the facts we want. I wanted to ask the Senator about this before he takes his seat: Is it not a fact that we have almost criminally neglected to save these valuable by-products of mining and smelting in this country, and that that is one of the troubles we are having in supplying the American market? In Europe they save everything, and that is the reason why they have the big supplies of by-products of the coke ovens, and so forth. Here we have been in the habit of letting those things go to waste.

Mr. SMOOT. Let me call the Senator's attention to the fact that Europe is quite different from the United States. There is sometimes what might be called a wicked waste of by-products from the mines; but what are you going to do with them? In Utah we have some of the largest smelters in the world. We could produce enough of one by-product, sulphuric acid, to furnish, I think, all the world. It would not be by hundreds of pounds or thousands of pounds; I think we could make almost a small stream, running continuously.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. If Utah runs short, we can supply the deficiency from Montana.

Mr. SMOOT. Montana could do the same. What could we do with it? The freight rate is higher than the article itself is worth. We can not afford to recover it, because if we

recover it, there is a cost attached to it, and we can not get a cent for it. The Senator is right when he says that in those things there is a waste, and I agree with my colleague, who stated a few moments ago that the American people are the most wasteful people, under the best of conditions, of all the people in the world. It is often stated that a Frenchman can live upon what an American family wastes. But we have a situation to meet. We can recover it, but there is a cost attached to recovering it, and we can not get a thing for it. It is not only a waste but it is a burden to the people who produce it, who are compelled to produce it under the existing conditions.

Mr. SIMMONS. Is it not a fact that we have not been saving much of this, but that we have been exporting it? Why could we not save enough to supply the American market?

Mr. SMOOT. The production of bismuth is quite a different proposition from the production of other by-products. There are ores all over the world which have no bismuth in them at all. For instance, I know of only two districts in our State which have even a trace of it. The cost of producing it is 75 cents a pound in Germany and nearly a dollar here. Wherever bismuth is recovered, there is a costly process required to recover it, and if they can not get enough to pay for the cost of it, of course it would go into the air, just as sulphuric acid does.

All we ask is $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent upon it, thinking perhaps that when things are normal that will equalize the conditions here and abroad and allow the producers to make just a small profit over and above the cost of taking it out. It is an economic question. It is not a question of the amount of duty. In Idaho they have bismuth, but it is always in small percentage; it is the same in Montana and the same in Utah. These ores are smelted there, and if they can not get a price equal to what it costs to recover it the bismuth is bound to go into the air or go into the slag. All that is requested on this item is $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.

Mr. KING. There is nothing before us to justify a low rate or a moderate rate or a high rate of duty upon the commodity under consideration. I think the Senate committee with equal propriety could have argued for a 1 per cent duty or 25 per cent duty as well as $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent duty. Much of what my colleague has stated I assent to.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not know whether my colleague heard me when I referred to the question of the European syndicate that handles all the bismuth of all the world outside of what is produced in the United States.

Mr. KING. Yes; I heard that statement.

Mr. SMOOT. If they wanted to control the situation in the United States, all they would have to do would be to bring their bismuth into the country when we began to produce it and cut the price. That would, of course, stop our domestic production of bismuth, and again they would control the situation and could let the price rise as it has in the past. Their price was as high as \$3 in 1918 and then dropped the following year to 97 cents. Of course there was not that difference in the cost of production. After that year, when the domestic production was again practically stopped, they advanced their price to \$2.50 a pound.

Mr. KING. Let me say to my distinguished colleague that American manufacturers showed very violent fluctuations in thousands of articles produced in the United States compared to the fluctuation to which reference has just been made.

Mr. SMOOT. During these years I do not think so. Following the war, or during the war, it is quite likely, but when we got into 1920 they charged \$2.50, because there was a shortage in the United States. Not only that, but this is what they do. They will not sell a single pound of bismuth to any purchaser in the United States unless he will sign an agreement that he will buy from them all of the bismuth that he may require during the year.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, with the permission of the junior Senator from Utah I would like to inquire of the senior Senator from Utah how many companies are actually producing bismuth.

Mr. SMOOT. Two are all in the United States.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Where are they located?

Mr. SMOOT. The American Smelting Co. and the United States Smelting Co.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. The American Smelting Co. is refining it at two smelters?

Mr. SMOOT. The United States Smelting Co. in Utah, and the American Smelting Co., wherever they are located.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Where do the United States Smelting Co. operate?

Mr. SMOOT. They have one smelter in Utah, and I think most of the bismuth is recovered in Utah.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. What amount are they recovering? What is the production?

Mr. KING. About 300,000 pounds.

Mr. SMOOT. They run from 122,000 pounds to 269,834 pounds.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Do they recover this by the bag-house process?

Mr. SMOOT. I think it is by electrolytic refining. That is how it is done. By the bag-house process they catch the metallic zinc.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. The Senator said by electrolytic refining?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; of the lead. It is a separate process entirely and only from lead.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Where do our foreign imports come from?

Mr. SMOOT. Germany.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Anywhere else?

Mr. SMOOT. Saxony, Germany, is about the only place. An English company controls the product, and they do have a refining process in one place in England. I think the process is the Betts process, as I remember it.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. The only reason that I can see why we should impose a duty would be to prevent exactions by foreign monopolies.

Mr. SMOOT. That is why we give it.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. The metal is exceedingly rare, and the cost of extracting it is so great that it would hardly be justifiable to impose this additional burden upon the sick people who are obliged to take bismuth unless it were—

Mr. SIMMONS. Oh, the senior Senator from Utah said it is not a medicine.

Mr. SMOOT. No; I said it was the raw material for a medicine. The Senator was talking about preparations from it.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. If we put this duty upon the crude bismuth, we will have to put a compensatory duty upon the finished product.

Mr. SIMMONS. The senior Senator from Utah and I had some little controversy about whether bismuth is a medicine. I asked what it was used for, and he stated, but he did not state that it is used as a medicine.

Mr. SMOOT. I certainly did, as the Senator will see if he will examine the RECORD.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. If it has any other use I never heard of it.

Mr. SIMMONS. That is what I said.

Mr. SMOOT. The greater part of it is not used in medicine at all.

Mr. SIMMONS. That is what the Senator said a little while ago. He said it was bismuth out of which medicine was made.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I have the floor, I believe, so let me answer a few of the questions of the Senator from Montana. I read:

Production is about 300,000 pounds annually, practically all as a by-product from the smelting of lead, copper, gold, and silver ores in Utah. Bolivia produces most of the bismuth of the world; some ore is also produced in Australia and Tasmania, which is mostly refined in Great Britain. Considerable bismuth ore has been produced in conjunction with tungsten in China which promises to be of increasing importance.

Imports of bismuth were 133,190 pounds, valued at \$241,448, in 1914. Imports come chiefly from Great Britain, but since 1915 some bismuth metal has come from South America, and still more recently China has become a principal source of supply.

So it would appear that we have no need to apprehend a foreign monopoly in Germany or Great Britain. Bolivia, Tasmania, and China will be the principal sources of the bismuth supply in the future.

Mr. SMOOT. That is the ore.

Mr. KING. That is the ore and, of course, it is from bismuth ore that we get the bismuth salts or the medicinal compound from the primary product.

Mr. SMOOT. Let me read what I stated to the Senator to be the use of it. I told the Senator that it was the raw material, not the product found in paragraph 20, about which he was talking.

The summary states:

It is a component of many easily fusible alloys which are used in manufacturing automatic fire sprinklers, electric fuses, and solders. Since it expands on solidifying from the molten state, it is used in some form of type and in metal bearings. The principal uses of bismuth, however, are in certain medicines and to some extent in the manufacture of cosmetics.

That is just what I stated to the Senator before.

Mr. SIMMONS. That would mean that we put the finished product of medicine upon the free list, but we put the raw material out of which the medicine is made upon the dutiable list.

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, no; the Senator will find that paragraph 20 takes care of the preparations of bismuth and that there is a duty placed upon it. It does not go on the free list.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, as I stated at the outset of my observations, so far as the facts or the evidence disclosed may be concerned, there is just as much reason for placing an ad valorem duty of 1 per cent or 25 per cent as 7½ per cent. In other words, there is no reason at all and no evidence at all to justify the imposition of a single duty, specific, ad valorem, or compound. The product comes chiefly from other countries. It is produced in the United States as a by-product, just like arsenic and other things that are carried in our ores.

Mr. SMOOT. I think it is quite different from arsenic. I think the Senator from Montana has stated the only reason, and that is the only reason why I would vote for 7½ per cent. It is controlled by the English syndicate, and they will make the United States pay for it unless we produce it and recover it in this country. There is no doubt about it at all. In the end I think it would be very much cheaper for the users of bismuth in the United States to have a duty of 7½ per cent ad valorem on it than to rely on the English syndicate that controls the prices and has made the United States pay extremely high prices in the past.

Mr. KING. Of course, I do not know as to the control of the product by the English syndicate. There is no reason why an English syndicate should control it. We have just as much opportunity for the acquisition of the ore in China or Bolivia as has Great Britain. My colleague knows that in Bolivia to-day some of the most extensive mining operations are carried on by Americans. The Americans are the best miners in the world. We have the best machinery in the world especially adapted for mining. I do not believe that any people in the world can compete with Americans in mining operations.

Mr. SIMMONS. I understood the Senator a little while ago to say that the metal is produced in certain countries which he enumerated.

Mr. KING. Yes; Tasmania, Bolivia, China, and the United States.

Mr. SIMMONS. That product is sold to Great Britain largely and they recover the bismuth?

Mr. KING. I did not know until my colleague stated, except what the Tariff Commission says, that it is mostly refined in Great Britain.

Mr. SIMMONS. Where it is refined is the place where the bismuth is extracted.

Mr. KING. The crude ore would be carried to Great Britain and there refined.

Mr. SIMMONS. So that our competitor probably is not Germany, as the senior Senator from Utah supposed, but is Great Britain.

Mr. SMOOT. Let us see whether it is or not by the same tariff report in a statement the Senator did not read:

Before the war Germany had three smelteries, which produced bismuth from ores mined in Saxony and Bohemia. Ore is also mined in England and Peru, and more recently in Korea.

I am informed by the Tariff Commission expert that the output or production of China is sporadic. They do not know whether it will amount to much in the future or not, but the prospects are, they say, up to the present time that it will, although in the past it has not come from there.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, my colleague has called attention, from the tariff report I presume, to the fact that there is some production in Germany. The summary from which I read did not give Germany as the source of any production. It did state, as I read, that Bolivia produces most of the bismuth of the world. Some ore is also produced in Australia and Tasmania. The Australian and Tasmanian ore is mostly refined in Great Britain. Bear in mind that to be refined in Great Britain the ore would have to be carried in bottoms of English or other ships from Australia and Tasmania that enormous distance half way around the world and refined and then transhipped to the United States in the finished product.

Mr. SIMMONS. And we have the ore right here.

Mr. KING. Yes; we have the ore right here at our doors. If it is produced in Utah, as my colleague says it is, and I think he is right, it is right at our door. It is a waste product. It is a by-product. We built our smelters in Utah and in Montana not for the smelting of bismuth or arsenical or sulphur ores, but for the purpose of getting the copper, lead, gold and silver, and those precious metals from the ore content.

Mr. SMOOT. My colleague said something about shipping the ore. The ore as it comes from the mine is not shipped in that form.

Mr. KING. It is shipped in the form of concentrates.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; the very highest concentrates.

Mr. KING. That may be.

Mr. SMOOT. They do not concentrate the whole of the ore, but they concentrate only the hand-picked ore, and then, when it is concentrated from the hand-picked ore, it comes over in the very highest percentage of bismuth.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President—

Mr. KING. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I should like a little further information from the Senator from Utah in reference to this matter. The Senator advises me that the bismuth is secured from the general matte through the electrolytic process.

Mr. SMOOT. That is true.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. After the copper or the lead, as the case may be, goes through the converter, it contains some other metals, in this particular case the bismuth. In the refining process the valuable metals, lead, gold, silver, and so forth, must be separated by the electrolytic process in order to be recovered. In that process the bismuth becomes a residuum.

Mr. SMOOT. That is true in the United States.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. That is to say that the bismuth, if it is in the ore, is separated by the electrolytic process. So what additional cost is there to the producer of copper and lead? Let us take copper matte, the principal constituents of value of which are copper and lead.

Mr. SMOOT. Bismuth is found almost entirely in connection with lead ores.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Very well. The lead can not be put on the market alloyed with the bismuth, and the process must be prosecuted in order to get the pure lead. When that is done, a residuum of bismuth remains.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; and that residuum is nothing but a mass of dirty mud. The Senator from Montana, no doubt, has seen what the residuum is. Nobody would think there was anything in it at all; the producers may throw that mud away, if they want to, and they will throw it away unless they can obtain a price that will justify taking the bismuth out.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Exactly. What is the process by which it is extracted? Of course, the residuum is metallic or else it is silica. I do not suppose it is silica, because silica would pass off with the slag. But what is the process and what does it cost to get the bismuth out of the residuum after the lead or copper is extracted by the electrolytic process?

Mr. SMOOT. The producers claim it costs about \$1.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. One dollar a what?

Mr. SMOOT. One dollar a pound in order to get it out, and that it costs in England and Germany about 75 cents.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. To get it out of what? What information has the Senator upon that subject?

Mr. SMOOT. I have the information which was given to the committee. The American Smelting Co. says that it costs about a dollar to do it here and about 75 cents in England and in Germany. The tariff board say:

As bismuth is produced in the United States entirely as a by-product, the cost of production depends entirely upon the percentage of each operation which is charged against the bismuth as compared with the other products recovered from the smelting operation.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. That is the point. The smelters charge the cost of the operation in part against the bismuth content. They are carrying on their operations for the purpose of recovering copper and lead, and they would have exactly the same cost whether bismuth was recovered or whether it was not recovered.

Mr. SMOOT. There is a refining cost, because after the lead is taken out the residuum of dirty mud must be put through a special process. I forget the name now of the process under which it is taken out, but it is patented. So the recovery of the bismuth—and that is what we are talking about—involves a separate item of cost.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I simply meant to give to the Senator my view about the matter. It occurred to me that, so far as the smelters are entitled to any tariff rate at all, it should be computed simply against the cost of extracting the bismuth from the residuum, after the refining of the copper.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Montana is exactly right, and that is what we tried to do in this case.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. But I can not conceive that that would be \$1 a pound.

Mr. SMOOT. If the price should decline to 75 or 80 cents a pound, there would not be any manufactured in the United States, because it would not pay to produce it. It is only a question of whether it is desired to take the mud after it has been separated and recover the bismuth which is in it. The extracting of bismuth from the mud is a most difficult process, and, as I am informed, a most disagreeable one. In the Tariff

Information Survey not only that feature is referred to but they say:

The production reported for 1915 is 570 metric tons. Export duties are levied by the Bolivian Government, and these were increased on the ground that bismuth ore production was subject to the control of a monopoly.

I have already referred to that.

Mr. President, I think if there is any commodity covered by this bill that may justly bear a duty of 7½ per cent ad valorem it is bismuth, if for no other purpose than to afford an inducement for the recovery of the bismuth in this country, rather than to let it go back into the rivers or into mother earth and become an economic waste.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I have not seen the recent figures, but in the publication known as Mineral Resources, issued by the Geological Survey, there is given as to production in 1918 the following:

In 1918 bismuth was recovered by only one company in the United States, the American Smelting & Refining Co., which obtained this product from the refining of lead bullion. Statistics of production can not be published.

I presume that is because the American Smelting & Refining Co. does not make the figures public. The imports for consumption in the United States in 1913 were 213,257 pounds; in 1914, 165,208 pounds; in 1915, 108,288 pounds. Can the Senator from Utah tell us about the American recoveries?

Mr. SMOOT. No; I can not say just how many pounds are produced annually. That depends upon the demand and, I presume, also upon the importations. In 1912, however, there were produced 122,080 pounds; in 1913, 213,554 pounds; in 1914, 251,486 pounds; in 1915—that is a year when the war was raging—316,716 pounds; in 1916, 245,676 pounds; in 1917, 318,187 pounds; in 1918, 266,499 pounds; and in 1920, 269,874 pounds.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Then it appears that under free importation the American Smelting & Refining Co. since 1912 has found it profitable to put on the market anywhere from 100,000 to 300,000 pounds of this product?

Mr. SMOOT. The two companies have. The United States Smelting Co. was the first one to recover it.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. That is to say, with perfectly free importation, they found it profitable to go through with the reduction process?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. And put that quantity of the product on the market?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; but in 1920 the price was \$2.50 a pound, and in 1921 it fell to \$1.25 a pound.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. The Senator will observe that we go back to 1912 there, as I understand; but the point I am making, regardless of conditions, is that 1912 was under the Payne-Aldrich bill. Subsequently we came in under the Underwood bill, and subsequently we encountered the war conditions; and, notwithstanding these varying circumstances and conditions, still these two companies found it profitable to put out from 100,000 to 200,000 pounds of this product annually, we will say, at an average price of \$1 a pound—\$100,000 to \$200,000 worth of the product.

Mr. SMOOT. I think the price was a great deal higher than that.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. All right. They found it profitable, I say, to put that on the market under these varying conditions. I can not believe that in those circumstances they are going to put out a pound more or a pound less because there is a duty or there is not a duty upon the product.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President—

Mr. SMOOT. I will simply say to the Senator that the prices are given for each year; but I will not take up the time of the Senate to put them in now, as the Senator from Mississippi wants to speak.

CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, one of the most significant incidents affecting the future policy of the Republican Party occurred night before last in the city of Washington. I refer to a meeting of the heads of the party and the representatives of some of the great manufacturing and banking interests who met here touching campaign contributions. It is significant in that it shows that the leaders who were present at this conference—I think there was only one Senator present, and that was the distinguished junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. PONT]; the others were heads of large interests, many of which are interested in this tariff legislation and in taxation legislation generally.

They have heard from the country. They have just come from their respective States. They know what the people are

talking about. Through every kind of medium they have come to the conclusion that there are grumbings in the air. They know that the soldiers are not satisfied with the wishy-washy policy of the Congress and the President touching soldier legislation. I notice that on yesterday, when an honorary degree was bestowed upon the President and he was introduced by Dean West, the compliment that brought a great deal of applause was the allusion that the introducer made to the manner in which the President was handling the so-called soldiers' bonus. He gave the impression to his audience that the President was against it. If he knows that, he knows something that no Senator knows and that nobody else in the country has been able to ascertain. If the dean takes one statement that the President made in his preelection campaign, of course, he might very properly infer that the President was for a soldiers' bonus. If he believes the speech that the President made here to the Congress when the so-called soldiers' bonus legislation was withdrawn and sent back to the committee, he would think that the President was not for the soldiers' bonus. If he takes some of the interviews that have been given out by some of the distinguished Senators who have visited the White House and have talked to the President touching soldiers' adjusted-compensation legislation, he might believe that the President was on either side of the question. He has been quoted as being for and against it.

So it is that the soldiers of the country are manifesting an indisposition toward this administration that has aroused them. The laboring people of the country, of course, understand how you are pressing down upon them in higher taxes and day by day and minute by minute are placing greater burdens on them and giving encouragement to all the employers of the country to reduce wages, but at the same time by legislation increasing the cost of living upon them; so there is grumbling upon the part of the great laboring classes of the country, not only against the Congress, if you please, but also against the action of the occupant of the White House.

Of course, the legitimate and honest business interests of the country are thoroughly disgusted with the manner in which you have legislated and the way in which you have failed to solve the great problems that are pressing upon this Congress, among them the taxation bill and this bill by which you are attempting to erect a tariff wall around the country and cause other countries to retaliate against us and prevent these honest business interests from selling their goods in foreign markets. So it is enough to know that the people of the great Middle West who have been crying for irrigation and reclamation, appealing to Senators to pass the McNary-Smith bill, and it does not come, are naturally dissatisfied—business, laboring people, soldiers, everybody up in arms against you, your record, and your policies. So it is that these representatives of the Republican Party outside of this Chamber and the House, fresh from home, meeting here, trying to adopt a policy that might change the trend of events and bring success to your party in November, have gone out determined to buy the coming election.

That was the object of the meeting, and "men high up" participated in that conference. Cabinet members were there—Secretaries Weeks, Mellon, Daugherty, and Hoover, some of them personally interested in certain legislation now being passed in this tariff bill—John T. Adams, Charles D. Hilles, and others. All the Cabinet officials evidently made addresses, and so did Vice President Coolidge, whose speech was declared by those who heard it to have been a "rip snorter." I do not know what "rip snorter" means. I have looked in the dictionary and do not find a definition of it. But, anyway, this paper says that those who were at the meeting said that the Vice President made a "rip-snorting" speech.

I saw one paper that said it was a "humdinger." I do not know what "humdinger" means. I looked in the dictionary for the definition of it also, and the nearest approach I can find to it is "humbugger—one who humbugs." And so these distinguished men were there with Wrigley, who said: "I am not a speaker, but here is my check for \$25,000," and he handed it over to Chairman Adams. It is said that it must have cost every one of those distinguished representatives who were there some three or four thousand dollars to eat at that table. Why, the Baltimore Sun has on the first page this morning:

G. O. P. to raise unlimited funds for campaign.
Wealthy members of party to be asked to give "until it hurts." Thorough canvass in every State. Hays's \$1,000 rule to be ignored in individual contributions.

Listen to what is to be the future policy of the Republican Party in order to carry the election. All hopes of carrying it upon "redeemed promises," "pledges fulfilled," are gone:

The sky is the limit for contribution to the Republican campaign fund this year. The \$1,000 limit established by Will H. Hays for the 1920 campaign, which ran his party into a deficit of \$1,500,000, has been entirely abandoned and a group of the "fat-purse" boys—

One of them was Mr. Patterson, of the National Cash Register Co., about whom we talked on yesterday; and upon motion made to reconsider the vote whereby you gave to him a special privilege of 25 per cent ad valorem upon the importation of cash registers into this country you turned a deaf ear to our appeals and refused to reconsider it, and thereby took cash registers off of the free list and imposed this high tariff. Then, there was Wrigley, who got up the slogan "Wiggle and Wobble," whom you took care of in the revenue bill by taking the tax off of the chewing gum made by Wrigley. You provided by law that railroads no longer could give rebates, and yet here the Republican Party says: "Give us a large contribution, Mr. Wrigley," and he hands over a \$25,000 check, and they rebate him by putting through Congress a law that will take a tax off of chewing gum.

Mr. Patterson says, "I will contribute. I will go out into Dayton, Ohio, and raise large sums of money from special interests who are favored by your legislation"; and then you say, "If you do we will rebate you," and you do rebate him by putting a protective tariff of 25 per cent ad valorem upon his manufactured article of cash registers, and thus you have adopted the new policy. And thus the new scheme of rebating goes on. The larger the contribution, the greater the rebate.

Oh, some of these expressions no doubt come from the bulletins that were issued in the campaign two years ago, wherein your campaign treasurer and your other campaign officials all admitted that you spent about \$7,500,000. "The sky is the limit" now, and you intend to adopt the same tactics in order to buy up the coming election. Why, only to-day I read from an International News Service dispatch "that one Senator" who, the paper said, did not have much opposition up in Pennsylvania, one who had voted to seat the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. NEWBERRY] after he had been here, I think, only about two or three days as a Senator, spent in his primary in the State of Pennsylvania—that he accounted for—around \$60,000, and there were such large contributions to his campaign that he was able, if the papers state it correctly, to turn back to them some eleven or twelve thousand dollars. To-day what we thought was a great Progressive victory in the State of Pennsylvania is shown to be "a false alarm." It has all gone up. "They met to-day to select a State chairman to run the campaign this year in Pennsylvania, and the old guard, the old crowd that has carried things heretofore in Pennsylvania," extorting from the special interest these campaign contributions, "again got into the saddle and elected Mr. Baker the State chairman over Mr. Pinchot's opposition. They elected the new junior Senator from Pennsylvania as the national committeeman from Pennsylvania." Thus is revealed the new policy of the present administration to try to carry the elections in November. Oh, how natural read these bulletins which were used during the last campaign in order to obtain campaign contributions. The same kind will be used this time, I suppose. Here are some of them; this is the way they read:

Harding and Coolidge have the confidence of the people. Buy, boys. Get the money.

Boys, get the money. The weather is hot, the men are on vacation, meetings are hard to get; but, boys, get the money.

That is the language of the Republican bulletin issued two years ago in order to raise a slush fund to elect the present President of the United States and a majority in the Senate and the House.

There are hills to climb, but if you want to make a hill at the same speed you have been running where the road is level you have got to give it more power. Give her the gas; step on it. Get the money.

Listen to that: "Give her the gas; step on it. Get the money." Said another of these bulletins:

Chicago's campaigns are to be conducted with four full-time divisions and five reserve divisions, which will swing into action the last three days on the public movement, functioning as a "mop-up" battalion.

What did they mean by "mop-up battalion"? The same thing this conference resolved upon night before last.

Another bulletin, of August 5, said:

Our readers are requested not to make this publication public. It is confidential. It is exclusive.

That is the kind of "dope" you sent out to get money, and told them to say nothing about it. I do not know how the meeting held the other night was made public. Somebody squealed. They said that Secretary of Commerce Hoover made a great speech. It evidently was not as good a speech as the Vice President's, because the Vice President's speech was a "rip snorter" and a "humdinger." This bulletin said:

The names and the amounts subscribed by donors should not be made public locally.

And why? It is your practice to do things under cover. Thus the leaders of the Republican Party are now beginning to get up a campaign fund which will buy the election. But let me say this: That the American people are reading. They

know what is going on in the Senate of the United States and in the House of Representatives. They know how the big dinners are being held in the White House. They know who are being invited there, and that the dinners are being held when legislation favorable to the representatives of those interests is being enacted. They know that just when this meeting of "big guns" was being held you were voting to give the National Cash Register Co. this new special privilege. The distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS] said that Mr. Patterson told him the next day that he did not want the protection, and yet in the next breath the Senator from Ohio refused to vote to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was adopted and wanted to throw it to him anyhow. Perhaps he thought that through your generosity he would make his contribution larger.

The American people will know, and they know now, what is going on, and that in order to fight you the party to which I belong will not be able to call in the representatives of these great special interests, because we have never legislated in their interest. We have tried to legislate in the interest of all the people, without special privileges and favoritism to a few. But from the hills, the small villages, and the little towns, as well as large cities, from all over this country, workshops and counting rooms, farms and schoolrooms, mining camps and ranches, the small contributions will come in to the party that opposes you, in order that your political infamy may be condemned, and "a Government of the people, for the people, and by the people" may again be given control of the Government.

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. KING. I understood the Senator to state that among the distinguished personages attending this fat-frying meeting was the Attorney General of the United States. I want to inquire whether that information has been received by the Senator?

Mr. HARRISON. This information is published in the New York Times of this morning, and in other papers. I think it is generally understood. There are gentlemen present in this Chamber who were there, and they could inform us, if they would, about it. There is no question about it, I assume, and it would be the natural thing for Daugherty to be there.

Mr. KING. It seems to me that it is bad enough for Cabinet officers to participate in a meeting of that character, but I can not for the life of me comprehend, in the light of the fact that suits ought to be instituted for the enforcement of the Sherman antitrust law and for war frauds, how the Attorney General could be present at a meeting of that character and participate in it. Of course, it is obvious that the scheme is to obtain an enormous fund to use at the coming election. It is obvious that the plan is to cause Republicans to win and to perpetuate the Harding machine, to perpetuate Harding men in power; but in view of the prosecutions which are pending, and which ought to be brought, it does seem to me that the Attorney General should not participate in a meeting of that kind, which was called for the purpose of obtaining money from the big interests of the United States.

Mr. HARRISON. I agree thoroughly with the Senator; but the Senator will recall that only very recently, while this tariff bill was being written, one of the most distinguished Members of the majority side on the Finance Committee, the spokesman of the President, the gentleman who was sent to Indianapolis the other day to sound the keynote, wrote a letter to certain representatives of special interests throughout this country appealing to them to send in their contributions, so that Republican propaganda might be sent out broadcast through the country. So you are working it from every direction—from the White House, from this Chamber, and from the dinner parties attended by the Vice President down.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, the Senator from Mississippi said very truly that the American people are reading and thinking. The American people remember that when a Republican administration took office, and a Republican majority in Congress, together with it, assumed responsibility for liquidating the economic consequences of the war and the mismanagement of the war, they had a heavy task before them. The American people have not forgotten that when a Republican administration was inaugurated in Washington last year the current expenditure of the National Government was at the rate of \$8,000,000,000 a year. They know that the rate of expenditure established under the Budget system and under the appropriations of this Congress will not exceed \$3,500,000,000 a year.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President—

Mr. McCORMICK. The Senator will permit me to continue, I hope.

Mr. HARRISON. This is a very important suggestion.

Mr. McCORMICK. I hope the Senator will be good enough to permit me to continue. I did not interrupt him.

The American people appreciate, they understand, that taxation has been reduced in the sum of \$1,000,000,000 a year; they know that the burden of every income-tax payer, great and small, has been lightened; they know that every one of them pays less than under the Democratic administration; that the tax of the small income-tax payer who is raising a family has been halved; that "nuisance" taxes have been abolished; that railroad rates, which were successively increased 5, 15, and 25 per cent, first by the Interstate Commerce Commission and then by fiat of the President, under the Wilson administration, have been reduced during the last few weeks. They have not forgotten that as a consequence of the administrative anarchy and the economic chaos from which the country suffered during the last months of the Wilson administration there was a liquidation in the price of agricultural products until corn was sold for 20 cents a bushel at the siding, whereas to-day it sells for 50 cents a bushel.

The American people know that during the last 90 days 2,000,000 idle men have gone to work because, despite the filibuster, there is promise that this tariff bill will become a law.

The American people know that by the time cold weather comes on there will not be an idle man in this country; aye, they know that even to-day the abnormal unemployment in Great Britain is six times per capita what it is in the United States. They know that in Scandinavia unemployment is still increasing. They know that whereas agriculture in America is beginning to thrive again, it remains prostrate in the Argentine, in Brazil, and in Chile. The American people know that by degrees the wreck of the railways of the United States, bequeathed to us, is being brought to order.

I count it no offense against good citizenship that Mr. Adams and his associates are planning to bring the facts to the knowledge of the American people.

If the reports of the new steel merger be true, it will not be long before that distinguished Wilsonian, Mr. Chadbourne, again will be able freely to contribute to the Democratic campaign fund. That estimable citizen, already rewarded, and I hope to be rewarded again when the Democratic administration comes into power—

Mr. KING. Which will be soon.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. Charles R. Crane has returned in season to contribute to the Democratic campaign fund.

Mr. B. M. Baruch before he sailed for Europe announced that he would shortly return. That most able of the Democratic servants of the country during the war, able and expert in markets both bull and bear, will be back in time to contribute to the Democratic campaign fund this year.

My colleague refers to Mr. Cleveland Dodge. I very well remember when Mr. Cyrus McCormick, the Democratic head of the harvester combine, had subscribed to the Wilson campaign fund, the subscription was most acceptable until it became public, when the Democratic National Committee assessed Cleveland Dodge, the copper king, to pay off Cyrus McCormick, the harvester king.

Mr. HARRISON. Now, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCORMICK. The Senator from Mississippi, reading from one of the Democratic newspapers upon his desk, said, "The sky is the limit." The sky is the limit for the unfounded charges and the rodomontades to which the opponents of this administration, who seek to obstruct the reconstruction of the country, give utterance during these days in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator overlooked the fact that I have the Chicago Tribune on my desk, did he not?

Mr. McCORMICK. I did not, but the Senator has before him a most excellent newspaper with which I am not infrequently in disagreement.

Mr. HARRISON. And on the tariff in total disagreement. As the Senator was speaking I wanted to say something about the conference. As the chairman of the senatorial campaign committee, a great honor, having in charge the defeat of Democrats or the selection of Republicans in the coming campaign, he was not invited to this conference. If he was, then he declined the invitation, because the papers do not state that the distinguished Senator was there.

Mr. McCORMICK. The Senator was not there. He was not invited. He first learned of the conference from the lips of a Democratic colleague.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator should read the Chicago Tribune and he would get all this information. I notice this

statement, which I did not read at first, but when the Senator talks in the fashion he does and fails to defend or praise the action of the conference I am inclined to believe that he is "nursing a sore toe," and he has a reason for it. If the statements touching this conference are correct, the chairman of the Republican National Committee has unhorsed the distinguished Senator from Illinois from further political participation in the election of senatorial candidates in November. I read:

The national committee will take almost complete charge of the campaign this year, both the senatorial and congressional committees having been, with the consent of the chairmen, relegated to places of comparative unimportance.

I do not imagine that it is because of the failure of the distinguished Senator to measure up to the high duties that necessarily devolve upon the chairman of the senatorial campaign committee, but I sympathize with him in having been relegated to a place of "comparative unimportance" and being side-tracked in such a brutal way.

THE TARIFF.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7456) to provide revenue, to regulate commerce with foreign countries, to encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, because reference has been made to that Middle West newspaper so highly commended by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCORMICK], I desire to call attention to an editorial which appeared in its issue of May 23, 1922, touching the bill now under consideration.

The revolt against the Payne-Aldrich law had its chief center in that great productive region of our country of which the city of Chicago is the center. The people of that locality—and I speak now of the Mississippi Valley generally and the region known as the Middle West—are generally Republican. They are generally attached to the principles of a protective tariff, but they found in that measure—the Payne-Aldrich law—so much that was indefensible from the standpoint of any principle of protection that there was a general revolt against it. That revolt was expressed in the Senate by the two distinguished Senators from the State of Iowa, DOLLIVER and CUMMINS, and by the then Senator from Kansas, BRISTOW, by the then Senator from Indiana, BEVERIDGE, and others. Although no strong voice from that section has been heard in opposition to the pending bill, the Chicago Tribune, which reflects the sentiment of the people of that great productive region, has found much to criticize in it. I read the editorial to which I have referred:

WHEN TARIFF DOES NOT PROTECT.

The common argument in favor of a protective tariff is to the effect that without such tariff the products of cheap foreign labor, perhaps combined with cheap raw materials and low overhead costs, can compete so successfully with American products in American markets as to put the American competitor out of business, close his factory, or reduce his workmen to starvation wages. That is a good argument. But it doesn't always hold. There are situations in which the reverse is true.

Consider the aluminum business—

We shall be presently considering the item in the bill—

Consider the aluminum business, which we have mentioned before, not because of any antipathy but because it appears to afford a startling illustration of possible dangers in a high protective tariff. The production of crude aluminum in the United States is controlled by a monopoly—the Aluminum Co. of America. In addition to producing virtually all the aluminum smelted in this country, that concern, through its subsidiary corporations, is a large producer of fabricated aluminum, such as kitchen utensils, and incidentally makes a vast amount of aluminum castings for use in automobile manufacture.

The Senator from North Dakota, in charge of the bill, the other day when we reached the item of articles made of aluminum, particularly for household use, thought it advisable to reconsider the rates in the bill, a very judicious action on his part. I continue:

It has as competitors some 35 or 40 independent aluminum cooking utensil manufacturers and several hundred independent aluminum foundries. It supplies these independents with ingots and sheets from which their products are manufactured. It is frequently delayed in filling orders for such materials. The better business becomes and the greater the demand for materials the more likely is the supply to be delayed.

Two courses then are open to the independents. They can buy abroad or close or restrict their plants. A prohibitive tariff would prevent them from buying abroad. It would also allow the monopoly to put any price it might desire upon its supplies. The effect upon these independents, employing some 10,000 men, is easily understood. It goes further than that. The average weight of aluminum used in automobiles is estimated at more than 100 pounds. The effect of protection of the monopoly upon our vast automobile business would be important.

Yet a tariff which the independents consider prohibitive, and which they say would allow the monopoly to close their plants and put their workers out of a job, is now on the schedule. And that "protection" is asked by and for a monopoly which earned more than \$10,000,000 net in 1920 on a capitalization of less than \$19,000,000. If such a tariff arrangement could be made in the aluminum business—

I would like to invite the attention of the Senator from Illinois to this—

If such a tariff arrangement could be made in the aluminum business, there is little doubt that a similar arrangement exists among others of the thousands of items on the bill. Such a duty does not protect. It exploits. It demands careful investigation of the entire bill.

But the Senator from Illinois would like to have us hurry the thing through without making an examination whatever of the specific items in the bill. However, the leading paper of his home city seems to commend the efforts of Democratic Senators upon this side of the Chamber in endeavoring to give to the country the facts in reference to those specific items.

Mr. McCORMICK. That very newspaper urged the ratification of the treaty of Versailles with the League of Nations. It is in error at times. The Senator will not charge me with having urged the ratification of that treaty with or without reservations.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. There is a sort of common view in this region that the Senator directs the policy of that paper.

Mr. McCORMICK. If the Senator from Montana will take the trouble to inform himself, he will learn that the Senator from Illinois has no interest in the paper; that he exercises no influence upon its policy, and has not for over a decade.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. It is a matter of no consequence to the Senator from Montana either one way or the other. It does profess to be the greatest newspaper in the world. It presumably speaks the views of a very large constituency in the region in which it circulates; at least I should imagine so. But the point I am making is that the paper, a leading Republican paper, is commending those of us who are endeavoring to scan the various items in the bill lest there shall appear to be in it thousands of items that are as open to criticism and objection as is the duty upon aluminum.

But I want to call the attention of the Senator from Illinois to this feature of it. I have no doubt the facts stated there are substantially correct. The matter of a duty upon aluminum was the subject of a very protracted discussion in the Chamber when the Underwood bill was under consideration. I say protracted discussion. A very protracted argument was made in favor of a duty upon aluminum by the then junior Senator from the State of Pennsylvania. Upon the vote taken my recollection is that it got few votes except his own and that of his colleague. But in this case we have a duty upon aluminum, and a very high duty upon the products of aluminum. If the President of the United States, under the terms of the bill, should deem that the duty placed upon aluminum does not equal the difference in the conditions of competition with respect to that article here and abroad, he can raise it, and thus put the manufacturers of aluminum products in the country, who are dependent upon the Aluminum Co. for their supply of raw material, at a greater disadvantage than they shall be subjected to by the rates fixed by the committee. In other words, the editorial calls our attention to the fact that it is impossible to apply a general rule, such as is laid down in section 316 and the subsequent sections, to all these conditions which shall arise and do justice or carry out even the principle of protection upon which the bill is said to be founded.

Mr. GERRY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a communication received by me, and ask that it may be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNARY in the chair). Without objection the Secretary will read as requested.

The Assistant Secretary read as follows:

Resolved, That we protest against the food, tableware, and women's wear schedules of the Fordney-McCumber bill. These schedules will increase the costs of living in every American home. They are fines levied by American men upon American women and upon American children. They should not be allowed to become law.

AVIS A. HAWKINS,
Director of Thrift, R. I. S. Fed. W. Clubs,
Chairman Woman's Co. on Schools.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The communication will lie on the table.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I think all the information that seems to be available relative to the item under consideration has been submitted to the Senate. Briefly recapitulating, it is this: We are consuming approximately 300,000 pounds of bismuth annually. A great portion of that amount is used for medicine. All who are familiar with medicines and with hospitals and with diseases know that bismuth is a very important factor in the treatment of certain kinds of diseases. Its use is becoming more important as the days go by and as advance is made in the science of medicine. Of course, there should be a desire to furnish medicines to people as cheaply as possible, and there can be no defense for any policy that seeks to increase the price of medicines. Those who believe in any tariff duties ought certainly not to ask for tariff rates upon medicine and

other commodities that are so indispensable to the health of the people.

There is produced in Bolivia, perhaps, the greatest amount of bismuth ore. Tasmania and Australia furnish some bismuth ore; China is becoming a field for the production of that ore; some little is also produced in Germany, and some is produced in the United States. It is manufactured in the United States by two smelting companies—the United States Smelting Co. and the American Smelting & Refining Co. Those companies have not erected their smelters for the purpose of producing arsenic or bismuth or a number of other by-products. Those great smelters have been erected for the purpose of reducing the sulphide ores and lead ores and other ores containing precious metals. Arsenic and bismuth are by-products. Whatever is recovered of those products is that much gain.

Now it is proposed to add further amounts to the already overflowing treasuries of those two great smelting organizations which have been denominated the Smelting Trust. It seems to me such action can not be defended at all. I think that bismuth should be in the future, as it is now and has been in the past, upon the free list. The people need it for medicine and we ought not to increase the burdens resting upon this article which is so important to the health of the people.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of a bill—

Mr. SMOOT. Let us get at least one vote here to-day. I think we had better do so before the Senator from Georgia asks to take up another matter.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. I now renew my request for unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 910) for the relief of Frank Gryla. Briefly stated, this is the case of a Government employee who was engaged in the service in Alaska, and some charge having been preferred against him, he was suspended while the charge was investigated. The investigation resulted in his complete exoneration.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask the Senator to defer his request for the present. I have written a letter to the department with reference to that bill, and I wish to get a reply and some further information before the bill is considered.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. The bill simply gives this man relief for the time during which he was suspended.

Mr. SMOOT. I know that; but it proposes to pay him when he did not do any work for the Government and was out of the service.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. But the Government did not let him do anything.

Mr. SMOOT. I am aware of that; but, nevertheless, the fact remains that he did not do anything; and I wish to ascertain the details of the case.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is made to the consideration of the bill. The Secretary will state the next amendment of the Committee on Finance.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, on page 85, after line 7, to insert:

PAR. 376c. Metallic arsenic, 6 cents per pound.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, before voting on the committee amendment, I should like to have the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot] or some other member of the Committee on Finance explain that item.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator will remember that white arsenic was placed on the dutiable list at 2 cents a pound. Metallic arsenic is made from white arsenic, and it takes about 3 pounds of white arsenic to make 1 pound of metallic arsenic. The Senator will find white arsenic provided for in paragraph 1 of the bill with a rate of duty of 2 cents a pound.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, both white arsenic and metallic arsenic have been taken off the free list and put on the dutiable list. I think a duty on either is unjustifiable; but, as there may be some difficulty in obtaining a quorum now, and as we will have no trouble when we reach the consideration of the free list to raise the issue with the committee on a direct vote, I am willing to let it go without a roll call at this time.

Mr. SMOOT. I think that that issue ought to be made when we take up the free list, and that white arsenic should be taken up first.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. We will take them both together at that time.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; they may be both considered together at that time; but I wish to say that the compensatory duty upon metallic arsenic is a little over $3\frac{1}{2}$ cents a pound. If white arsenic is retained on the dutiable list at 2 cents a pound, we must give metallic arsenic a compensatory duty.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I had a small part in the discussion of the duty of 2 cents a pound on white arsenic, which I think was then demonstrated to be utterly indefensible. I might here repeat that white arsenic is a by-product of the smelting of copper and lead ores. Anyone who owns a copper smelter, the ore of which contains any considerable quantity of arsenic, is obliged to take the arsenic out; otherwise, it would escape in the fumes from the smelters and destroy all vegetable and, to no little extent, animal life in the region of a very wide radius of which the smelter would be the center. There will not be a pound of arsenic produced by reason of the duty, because all there is must now be taken in some way out of the ore. I should like, however, to inquire of the Senator from Utah how I shall get confirmed the information he gives us that it takes 3 pounds of arsenious acid to 1 pound of metallic arsenic?

Mr. SMOOT. I do not know that I have the data here at this time.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. My recollection about the matter is that arsenious acid is a combination of oxygen and arsenic, with the arsenic the dominant element.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator is wrong about that. Sulphide of arsenic is still on the free list, I will say to the Senator; it has not been taken off the free list. A duty of 2 cents a pound has been imposed on white arsenic. Metallic arsenic is made from white arsenic, and the compensatory duty is between $3\frac{1}{2}$ and 3½ cents a pound.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Can the Senator tell me the chemical constituents of white arsenic or arsenious acid?

Mr. SMOOT. White arsenic contains 75 per cent of metal and in converting that into metallic arsenic there is a loss of at least $33\frac{1}{3}$ per cent. If the Senator will make the calculation on the basis of the cost of white arsenic to-day, he will find the differential is about $3\frac{1}{2}$ cents a pound, considering the loss involved in conversion and the fact that white arsenic contains only 75 per cent of metallic arsenic.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. From what source does the Senator get information to the effect that it takes 3 pounds of white arsenic to make 1 pound of metallic arsenic?

Mr. SMOOT. I get it from the expert of the Tariff Commission.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Is it published?

Mr. SMOOT. I said 3 pounds in the first place, but I should have said that there is required a compensatory duty of from $3\frac{1}{2}$ to $3\frac{3}{4}$ cents a pound.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. That is the compensatory duty?

Mr. SMOOT. The compensatory duty on metallic arsenic, with the duty on white arsenic at 2 cents a pound, is from $3\frac{1}{2}$ to $3\frac{3}{4}$ cents a pound.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Exactly; that is, a duty of 2 cents a pound on white arsenic would require a compensatory duty of $3\frac{1}{2}$ cents on metallic arsenic.

Mr. SMOOT. No; more. The compensatory duty added to the 2 cents makes $5\frac{1}{2}$ cents, without giving any protection whatever in the conversion.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. That is what I am endeavoring to express. That is, a duty of 2 cents a pound on white arsenic will require, in order to be compensatory, a duty of $3\frac{1}{2}$ cents on metallic arsenic.

Mr. SMOOT. No; the compensatory duty over and above the 2 cents will be from $3\frac{1}{2}$ to $3\frac{3}{4}$ cents. That would make from $5\frac{1}{2}$ to $5\frac{3}{4}$ cents on the metallic, and the differential then between that and 6 cents, as provided, represents the protection that would be accorded for the conversion of it.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. That is to say it practically requires a duty of $5\frac{1}{2}$ cents in order to take care of the compensation?

Mr. SMOOT. That is, if we put a duty of 2 cents on white arsenic.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. That seems rather remarkable to me.

Mr. SMOOT. That is the result, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I know the Senator says so; but how does he reach that conclusion?

Mr. SMOOT. I will repeat to the Senator that white arsenic only contains 75 per cent of metallic arsenic.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. That is to say that white arsenic consists of 75 per cent arsenic and 25 per cent oxygen?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; and then in the conversion of that there is one-third loss.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. That reduces it to 50 per cent.

Mr. SMOOT. That reduces it to more than that. It would be 50 per cent on a hundred per cent, but 75 per cent is all there is.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Exactly; and one-third of 75 per cent is 25 per cent; so that there is 50 per cent of metallic content in a pound of white arsenic.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Instead of multiplying by 3, you ought to add a third.

Mr. SMOOT. Without any loss whatever in the conversion, the compensatory duty that would be required is 2½ cents; and a loss of one-third of the 75 per cent metallic arsenic content in the process of recovery would require, as I have said, from 3¼ to 3½ cents.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Let me inquire of the Senator who produces this product?

Mr. SMOOT. Does the Senator mean abroad or here?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. No; here. Who makes the metallic arsenic?

Mr. SMOOT. I do not know whether the United States Smelting Co. does or not, but I do know that the American Smelting & Refining Co. produces it. Both of them produce it, I understand. In fact, I suppose they produce it wherever they have bag houses to catch the arsenic.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I am not speaking about the white arsenic. I mean, who takes the white arsenic and converts it into metallic arsenic?

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that it was never done in this country until the war. The concern that produces the most is the Hoskins Metal Co., of New York, but there are one or two others. I will get the list, if the Senator wants it.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. What is the metal used for?

Mr. SMOOT. The great use of it is for the hardening of metals.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Iron and steel?

Mr. SMOOT. Iron and steel and lead, particularly.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Where do we get that information?

Mr. SMOOT. From the Tariff Commission. If I remember correctly, it is in paragraph 1553.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I have made a very careful examination—

Mr. SMOOT. No; that is not the paragraph; but I will say to the Senator that it is here, because I have read it to-day.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Let me suggest to the Senator that that item, which would follow very much after the article of arsenic, go over until the disposition of—

Mr. SMOOT. We have already disposed of white arsenic. Whenever we reach the free list, from which they were taken, we can reconsider white arsenic, and whatever action we take upon white arsenic, we must take the same action upon metallic arsenic; but this is simply to take care of the 2 cents duty that was put upon white arsenic.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JONES of Washington in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. The next amendment is to paragraph 377, page 85, line 10, where it is proposed to strike out "ad valorem" and to insert the same words with a semicolon and the words "nickel-silver sheets, strips, rods, and wire, 30 per cent ad valorem," so as to make the paragraph read:

PAR. 377. German silver, or nickel silver, unmanufactured, 20 per cent ad valorem; nickel-silver sheets, strips, rods, and wire, 30 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, the tax on this product has been very considerably increased. Under the Payne-Aldrich bill the tax was 25 per cent ad valorem on the German silver in these products. This is an old, old manufactured product. It is nothing new. It has been known in commerce for many, many years. If I recollect aright, although it is called German silver, the United States is the principal consumer and also the principal producer, and has been for many years.

This business had a tax of 25 per cent ad valorem under the Payne-Aldrich law, and, if I recollect aright, it was about the same under the Dingley law, although I have not the figures of that law before me. The industry ran along with such a degree of prosperity that the United States became one of the principal producers in the world.

When the present law was written, finding that the imports were negligible in comparison to the production—I think in

1920 the imports amounted to only 200 pounds, and for the first nine months of 1921 to 2,448 pounds, valued at \$527, and before that the imports were along about the same lines—the committee that wrote the present law reduced the 25 per cent ad valorem under the Payne-Aldrich law to 15 per cent ad valorem. As I say, there has been no great increase in imports; but about the time that the present law was written the exports amounted to \$38,000 as compared to very small importations, and they increased in 1917 to \$410,000, and in 1920 the exports from this country had increased to \$589,508, and still large exports continued in 1921, with comparatively no imports.

The House had provided a rate on this commodity of 20 per cent ad valorem. The Senate committee leave that on certain classes, but on the nickel-silver sheets, strips, rods, and wire they advance the rate to 30 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, under the existing law the duty on nickel-silver sheets, strips, rods, and wire is higher than the duty on German silver, or nickel silver. The duty under the existing law is 15 per cent on German silver, or nickel silver, unmanufactured. The Payne-Aldrich law, as the Senator has stated, imposed a duty of 25 per cent ad valorem. The House gave a duty of 20 per cent ad valorem on those items, but left the nickel-silver sheets, strips, rods, and wire to come under the manufactured clause.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The basket clause, which is 20 per cent?

Mr. SMOOT. Twenty per cent; I mean under existing law.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Under existing law; yes. Then the committee, under these circumstances—and that is what I am talking about—raise it to 30 per cent ad valorem.

This is not as offensive a proposition as many in the bill to a man of my viewpoint. It is more or less a slight luxury, in the sense that people of ordinary means may have some of this kind of silverware on the table when they can not have solid silver; but, still, they do not have to have it. The industry, however, was not jeopardized under the rate in the Payne-Aldrich law, because it has continued its exports into the open markets of the world, competing in the open markets of the world in the sale of this silver. In fact, there has not been very much competition against it.

Mr. SMOOT. Under the Payne-Aldrich law, however, the sheets, strips, rods, and wires bore a duty of 45 per cent under the paragraph of manufactured articles.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am not sure which paragraph it fell under in the Payne-Aldrich law as unmanufactured, but—

Mr. SMOOT. Just the same as under the existing law—20 per cent.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. But here is the main thing that I am talking about: Under existing law the unmanufactured article bore a rate of duty of 15 per cent ad valorem and the manufactured article 20 per cent ad valorem. The business has gone on increasing its production, and it has gone on increasing its exports. It has been exporting for many years. Away back, decades ago, it was exported. There were exports to Canada, and even to Denmark and Japan and South America, Brazil and Argentina being large consumers, where it comes directly in contact with the foreign-made product without any advantage under tariff rates.

Under these circumstances I can not see any reason on the face of the earth for this change. You are going to get no appreciable revenue out of it. I think for two or three years the revenue from this article, even with a 15 per cent tax, amounted to less than \$100. It amounts to nothing as a revenue producer; but I suppose the committee found that the rate of the present law was so much, and under the general idea that any rate in the present law was too low they raised the rate.

I am not going to call for a roll call on the amendment, because if I did I am sure I would not succeed. Otherwise I would have a roll call; but this is not one of the great, important articles in this bill.

Mr. SMOOT. No; and I will say to the Senator that the only reason why these items were taken out of the basket clause of manufactures, where they have always been in every law—the Dingley law, the Wilson law, the Payne-Aldrich law, and the Underwood law—is that we wanted some kind of statistical information in relation to them.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am not objecting to your making a special paragraph of this; I am objecting to your rate.

Mr. SMOOT. I understand that.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. There is no reason in the world for this increase of tax. This class of silver does not require a great deal of workmanship. It is more or less pressed or molded. There is some polish on it. There is not so much labor on it. A great deal of it is a very cheap commodity, that allows people

of moderate means to decorate their tables. Of course, you may call it a semiluxury. If you were going to get real revenue out of a semiluxury, I would not object; but you do not get any revenue under the low rate and you will not get any under the higher rate. It is not a revenue-producing article, and it really would not affect it much if you reduced the rate.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator if he thinks we will not secure some more revenue under the little additional rate than we would if we left the law as it is?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. You have run for a number of years under the present rate with less than \$100 of revenue. Possibly some of these articles will come in that really do not compete. Perhaps there are some particular forms of the article that are pleasing to the fancy that come from abroad and that create a market for themselves. It is not that they are any better; they do not come in because they are produced cheaper; they are just a fancy. You may increase the revenue \$25, \$30, or \$50, but the only thing is that it will possibly give an excuse for the manufacturer behind that wall to raise his rates on the American people.

Mr. SMOOT. There is a resistance wire which is made from nickel that is used in different parts of the country now in electrical work, which the testimony shows was about what they wanted to protect. No one can tell how much has been imported in the past, because it has fallen in the other basket clause.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I understand the Senator. Of course, I do not know anything about the wire. I suppose the wire made of this product is introduced here for ornamental purposes in connection with electrical work; but I really am not informed on that question. It just comes down to this: Somebody introduces some new kind of ornamental wire and says he needs protection, and in order to give the protection to that small portion of this class of commodities, you greatly increase the rate.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to say to the Senator that if we gave what this particular man wanted, this rate would not be half enough.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am not talking about what he wants; I am talking about how you get at it. You just throw out all of this proposition. The Senator said that was the reason why you raised the rate.

Mr. SMOOT. But in the past it has been in the class of manufactured articles.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I understand that; but you are raising the rate, which is now 20 per cent on the manufactured article. I imagine that the cost of manufacturing this German silver into soup bowls or flower vases is very much cheaper than manufacturing it into wire, because wire is a thing you make usually by machinery entirely. Because this man wants some more protection on wire made out of this German silver, you are going to raise the rate 10 per cent to everybody who buys it. It is not a very material article, however, and I am not going to take the time of the Senate in discussing it. There are too many things in this bill of real importance to warrant us in taking up much time with this article.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the committee was, in paragraph 378, page 85, line 15, to strike out "engraver's" and insert "engravers'."

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is merely a change in language. This paragraph will be discussed when there is an opportunity for the minority to offer an amendment to it, which does not present itself at this time. There is no objection to changing the language.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the committee was, in paragraph 379, page 85, providing for a duty on aluminum, etc.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that that paragraph may go over.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I was going to say that that paragraph will probably lead to extended debate, and as I understand we are to adjourn early this afternoon, I think it ought to go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, paragraph 379 will be passed over.

The next amendment was, in paragraph 380, on page 86, line 8, before the word "cents," to strike out "50" and insert "60," so as to make the paragraph read:

PAR. 380. Gold leaf, 60 cents per 100 leaves. The foregoing rate applies to leaf not exceeding in size the equivalent of 3½ by 3½ inches; additional duties in the same proportion shall be assessed on leaf exceeding in size said equivalent.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Under existing law gold leaf is taxed 35 per cent ad valorem. As we have practically a monopoly of the gold of the world to-day, so far as money is concerned, I do not think much gold leaf will come in under a 35 per cent tariff. The House committee fixed 50 per cent in its bill, and the Finance Committee has raised it to 60 per cent.

I do not know that it is a matter in which the American people generally are very much interested, but I am enough interested to ask why the committee proposes to raise this rate on gold leaf from 35 to 60 per cent, when we have nearly a monopoly of the gold supply of the world now. It may be that the committee thinks we have too much gold in America. There are a great many people now arguing that theory of finance and they want to keep it all out. I would like to have the chairman advise us as to why the committee made this very great increase. I am sure I am not informed.

Mr. McCUMBER. It is a considerable increase. If the Senator will read in the tariff hearings, at page 2054, the statement of Mr. F. W. Rauskolb, representing the United States Gold Leaf Manufacturers' Association, he will get the data as to the comparative cost of manufacturing in the United States and in Germany. I will quote only this much from the evidence:

Wages: United States, \$44 per week per man; Germany, 300 marks at \$0.015—\$4.50.

Product: 5,000 leaves of gold 3½ by 3½ inches.

Raw material: Gold. (Gold is gold the world over.)

Labor cost per 100 leaves, 3½ by 3½ inches.

United States:		
Man	\$0.88
Booking girl28
Total	\$1.160
Germany:		
Man09
Booking girl024
Total114
Difference	1.046

While, of course, this rate does not attempt to measure the difference in these costs, we hope it will at least approach what may be adequate protection in the United States.

Mr. SIMMONS. I infer from what the Senator has said that the importations against which he fears harm will come to the American producer are from Germany, and only from Germany.

Mr. McCUMBER. I understand that is the only place from which it is now being imported, or has been imported for some time.

Mr. SIMMONS. I do not know about that. There is nothing in the Tariff Commission's statement which indicates that it is exported to this country from Germany. Of course, all through these schedules the assumption on the other side seems to be that everything which is imported into this country practically, especially of metals, comes from Germany, that we have no other competitor in the world except Germany, and that all these rates must be made to meet German wage conditions. There is nothing in the book which shows that these small importations, \$50,000 worth, I believe, during the nine months of 1921, came from Germany. I do not say they do not come from Germany.

I do not know whence they come. It seems to me a very trifling amount of importations compared with the annual output in America, valued at \$2,432,000, against \$50,000 of imports. Does the Senator know that they come from Germany, and that all of them come from Germany?

Mr. McCUMBER. I am certain that is the place from which the importations have been coming. I have not the testimony upon that point here, but all the data was upon the matter of the cost in this country and in Germany, and I am certain that the evidence showed the importations were from Germany.

If the Senator will turn to page 523 of the Summary of Tariff Information he will find the following:

Imports of gold leaf were \$32,482 in 1914. Later statistics follow:

Calendar year.	Quantity.	Value.	Duty.	Ad valorem rate.
	100 leaves.			Per cent.
1918.....	2,110	\$1,160	\$403	35
1919.....	59	43	15	35
1920.....	44,502	31,868	11,154	35
1921 (9 months).....	38,000	50,053		

Mr. SIMMONS. But there is nothing which shows that the imports come from Germany.

Mr. McCUMBER. But the Senator will find that in a few months we had imports of \$60,819, as compared with only

\$32,482 in 1914. That is almost double. Of course, there is not a great amount of this material being used, but it is very important to those who are producing here in the United States.

Mr. SIMMONS. That is not the point I am now raising. I admit these figures show that since 1914 the importations have increased from \$32,000 to about \$60,000 for the year 1921; that is true. But that is a very small amount compared with the annual production in this country of \$2,432,000. Leaving that out, however, the Senator has been reading to us a statement of the wages which are paid in the German factories, and I have asked him what evidence he has that the importations to this country come from Germany. I am not aware that Germany is the only country in the world that makes gold leaf, and why should the Senator assume that it comes from Germany unless he has the facts?

Then, again, Mr. President, the vice of this whole business, which permeates the bill from one end to the other, is the contention that we must lay duties which will exclude German products, which are said to be underselling the products of all the balance of the world, without any reference to the effect the high rates of duty which are necessary for that purpose will have upon our trade with every other country in the world.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. But why restrict it to Germany? Is it not a healthy thing to have \$60,000 worth of this product come in, wherever it may come from, to compete with \$2,432,000 worth of products made in this country in 1914? Why should we fix a tariff so as to absolutely shut out the foreign product; and is not that the actual condition of things with reference to a multitude of these items?

Mr. SIMMONS. If you put it high enough to shut out Germany, of course you absolutely shut out all the balance of the world.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Undoubtedly. That is the thing I want to get at. Does the Senator believe that the introduction of foreign goods in any quantity is desirable, or would he have foreign goods excluded altogether? In 1914 there were \$32,000 worth imported. It appears that in 1922, eight years afterwards, the imports went up to as high as \$60,000, as against a production of \$2,432,000 in this country in 1914. I daresay that has increased to probably \$3,000,000 by this time. Is it not a healthy thing to have \$60,000 worth coming in from the outside?

Mr. SIMMONS. The production has probably increased at equally as rapid a rate as the imports.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator asked me if there was any evidence whatever that this product came from Germany. Of course it is impossible to lay one's hand at a second's notice upon any definite part of the tariff hearings, but on page 27 of the Tariff Survey of 1921 I find this statement:

Foreign production: Germany is the chief and practically the only gold or silver leaf producing nation entering foreign trade in normal times. Since 1914 much of Germany's leaf trade has been taken over by Japan, but the leaf is of poor quality and, since the Government's export embargo on gold, has ceased entirely. Imports are confined to leaf from Germany.

This shows at least that I was justified in taking the German wages. We have shown very considerable and very rapid increases in the last year or two. We have shown the difference in the cost of producing as shown by the latest evidence. I will admit there is not much imported to-day from Germany, and why? Germany has need for every ounce of gold she can get. It must be paid in reparations and in other expenses. I appreciate the difficulty just at the present time of Germany coming back immediately into the production of gold leaf in any great quantity, but I do not anticipate that condition is going to last. Taking into consideration their wages, taking into consideration the rapid increase even under the stringent conditions of gold in Germany, I can see that there is great foundation for the apprehension of the American manufacturers as to whether they will be able to hold the American market. I do not think the increase of the House rate from 50 per cent to 60 per cent, or from 35 to 60 per cent as in the bill as compared with the present law, is at all excessive.

In answer to the statement made by the Senator from Montana as to whether it is a healthy condition to have even that small proportion, I can not say. If there was danger of prices becoming too high, it might require even a greater importation, and yet even that importation might necessitate driving wages down and cost of production down very considerably in this country. I can not say definitely what effect it would have, whether it would have a healthy effect or otherwise.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

Mr. McCUMBER. Will the Senator indulge me a moment?

Mr. SIMMONS. Certainly.

Mr. McCUMBER. There is a desire on the part of a great many Senators that we shall take a recess to-day at 4 o'clock. While I do not want to cut off debate at all upon this item, I was in hopes we might get a vote upon it this afternoon and then take a recess.

Mr. SIMMONS. If the Senator will pardon me for two minutes, so far as I am concerned, we may have a vote.

As I understand the Senator now, he claims that imports of the value of \$60,000 as against a production as far back as 1914 of nearly \$3,000,000 is dangerous and ought to be stopped. I am convinced that argument ought not to have the slightest weight unless we are engaged in the business of writing a prohibitive tariff.

The Senator admits that right now Germany has no gold. This is an article made out of gold. The Senator will also admit, I have no doubt that at this time the United States has at least nearly one-half of all the gold in the world. It is the only country in the world that has gold to spare. We have it locked up in our vaults. We have a billion dollars of it practically locked up in the vaults serving at present but very little good to the country.

The Senator recognizes, therefore, that in present conditions there ought to be no fear of Germany driving us out of the market in the sale of an article made of gold, of which product Germany is in possession of a very small amount, not enough to keep her currency at par, not enough to keep her currency at 1 per cent of par, while the United States has a billion dollars more than it needs for the purpose of keeping its currency at par.

There is no danger now whatever; but the Senator is legislating for a time in the future when Germany will be abundantly supplied with gold and when the United States probably will not have much more gold than is needed for the purpose of keeping its currency at par. That day may come, Mr. President, but I do not know. The time may come when gold will be possessed by Germany in greater quantities than it is by us and when we, therefore, shall be receiving her imports of gold products into America. But that day, I think, is pretty far distant. I think it is not just to the American people to impose upon them unnecessary taxation in anticipation of such an improbable and remote condition of affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, before we go into executive session I want to say to Senators that from present appearances we shall have to go back to our night sessions again. I hope it will not be necessary, but I wish to give notice that unless we can do better than we have done for the last two days it will be necessary to hold night sessions.

I want to say that both the leader of the minority side and the ranking member of the minority of the Finance Committee have done everything they could to facilitate action upon the bill since last Thursday and have asked their side and others to desist from bringing in extraneous matters, but it seems that those matters will creep in anyway. I am not saying that we will hold night sessions, but I want to give notice that I shall try to hold night sessions unless we can give a greater portion of the time to the bill.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I have no desire to delay the bill. I think it is a very bad bill, but the majority party has a right to pass it if it wants to do so. The bill must be debated. The country is entitled to debate and the country has profited from the debate. I have tried to cooperate with the Senator in charge of the bill to expedite it. Yesterday there was not much which came up out of the way. To-day there has been very little outside debate. The debate to-day has been on the bill, with very little exception.

I want to say to the Senator that if he wants night sessions he can "go to it." I have done my best, and if he is not satisfied we will just call it off right now, and he can go to it Monday night. I have nothing more to say about it.

I have tried to help, but I am not going to let the Senator from North Dakota threaten this side with any such proposition. If he wants night sessions he can order one for Monday night, and we will go back and fight the bill out.

Mr. McCUMBER. I do not think anyone in the Senate has ever heard anything from me that savored in the slightest degree of a threat.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not mean the Senator threatens me, but he has held this side up—

Mr. McCUMBER. I am not threatening anybody.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. There has been just as much extraneous debate on the Senator's side of the Chamber as on this side.

Mr. McCUMBER. Of course, when it starts on one side of the Chamber it is answered on the other side. As I said in the beginning, the Senator from Alabama has done all he could to help expedite the bill; and I hope he will continue it on Monday, so that there will not be any necessity for a night session. I sincerely hope so. I do not want to hold night sessions. I think if we work from 11 o'clock in the morning until 6 o'clock in the afternoon no one ought to be required to remain longer; and yet the time is slipping away and we do not seem to be accomplishing anything. I am only saying this to indicate that it may become necessary to hold night sessions. I shall cooperate, and I know others here will, with the Senator from Alabama to make that unnecessary.

Mr. SIMMONS. I am glad the Senator from North Dakota takes out of his original remarks what seemed to be a threat, because the Senator knows how reluctant people are to act under the coercion of a threat. I think we all realize that it is a little difficult to go from one tariff system to another. I believe in a short time we will find that we are making progress and probably we can justify the discontinuance of night sessions. If we do not, then the Senator can go back to them.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator will admit that we have not made very much progress in the last two days.

Mr. SIMMONS. We did not make much progress yesterday, because nearly half the time was taken up in general debate precipitated by the speech of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG] and the replies his speech invited.

Mr. McCUMBER. I am not objecting to any speech on the tariff, even though it may be a repetition of what has been stated many times. It is the extraneous matters which have taken up so much time.

Mr. SIMMONS. If the Senator will pardon me, to-day I have heard very little extraneous matter injected. The discussions have been entirely relative to the items in the bill. One or two items were discussed possibly at greater length than their importance justified.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. McCUMBER. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened and the Senate (at 4 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.), under the order previously entered, took a recess until Monday, June 12, 1922, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 10 (legislative day of April 20), 1922.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE.

The following-named doctors to be assistant surgeons in the United States Public Health Service, to take effect from date of oath:

Ralph L. Lawrence.

Edwin C. Sorens.

These doctors have passed the necessary examination required by law.

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY.

ADJUTANT GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT.

Maj. Samuel Greaner Talbott, Infantry, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Henry Henderson Pfeil, Finance Department, with rank from July 1, 1920.

ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT.

Capt. George Walter Hirsch, Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from August 23, 1920.

PROMOTION IN THE NAVY.

MARINE CORPS.

Second Lieut. Edward F. O'Day, to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of July, 1921.

POSTMASTERS.

ARIZONA.

Lutie Paxton to be postmaster at Flagstaff, Ariz., in place of C. F. Heisser, resigned.

COLORADO.

Richard H. Brown to be postmaster at Silverton, Colo., in place of W. N. Haas, resigned.

GEORGIA.

John H. Pullen to be postmaster at Meigs, Ga., in place of Thomas Davis, resigned.

IDAHO.

Omer S. Cordon to be postmaster at Rigby, Idaho, in place of Lida Cox. Incumbent's commission expired March 8, 1922.

ILLINOIS.

Hoyt B. Kerr to be postmaster at Brookport, Ill., in place of W. T. Holifield. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1922.

KENTUCKY.

Henry C. Mann to be postmaster at Kevil, Ky., in place of Morgan Kuykendall. Incumbent's commission expired July 21, 1921.

MAINE.

Roger S. McGown to be postmaster at Carmel, Me., in place of L. C. Whitten, resigned.

Carroll M. Richardson to be postmaster at Westbrook, Me., in place of C. S. Eastman, deceased.

MARYLAND.

Mary C. Worley to be postmaster at Riverdale, Md., in place of A. C. Klinger. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1922.

MINNESOTA.

George N. Breher to be postmaster at Wadena, Minn., in place of Christian Hunsinger, deceased.

MISSISSIPPI.

Henry C. Majure to be postmaster at Newton, Miss., in place of C. W. Carr. Incumbent's commission expired July 21, 1921.

MISSOURI.

Charles E. Colinot to be postmaster at Monticello, Mo. Office became presidential April 1, 1921.

Rachel Pinkley to be postmaster at Portageville, Mo., in place of Olive DeLisle, resigned.

NEW MEXICO.

Arthur W. Lyckman to be postmaster at Madrid, N. Mex. Office became presidential April 1, 1922.

NEW YORK.

Henry L. Parker to be postmaster at Scarboro, N. Y. Office became presidential April 1, 1922.

George W. Steele to be postmaster at Brockport, N. Y., in place of J. W. Larkin. Incumbent's commission expired January 27, 1920.

De Witt C. Talmage to be postmaster at East Hampton, N. Y., in place of J. F. Gilmartin. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1920.

Fisher M. Joslin to be postmaster at Voorheesville, N. Y., in place of J. F. Joslin, declined.

NORTH CAROLINA.

William D. Holland to be postmaster at Dunn, N. C., in place of E. T. Lee. Incumbent's commission expired July 21, 1921.

Francis D. Gibson to be postmaster at Gibson, N. C., in place of W. Z. Gibson. Incumbent's commission expired January 8, 1921.

James B. Fagg to be postmaster at Leaksville, N. C., in place of W. H. Lane, resigned.

John W. Gilliam to be postmaster at Sanford, N. C., in place of S. V. Scott. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1922.

Walter D. Warren to be postmaster at Sylva, N. C., in place of H. R. Hastings. Incumbent's commission expired April 6, 1922.

OHIO.

Arthur L. Behymer to be postmaster at Cincinnati, Ohio, in place of J. C. Clore, resigned.

Sage P. Deming to be postmaster at Rocky River, Ohio, in place of S. P. Deming. Incumbent's commission expired April 16, 1922.

OKLAHOMA.

Clinton L. Rogers to be postmaster at Caney, Okla. Office became presidential January 1, 1921.

William E. Nevin to be postmaster at Jet, Okla. Office became presidential January 1, 1921.

William F. Hutton to be postmaster at Oakwood, Okla. Office became presidential January 1, 1921.

William E. Baker to be postmaster at Ripley, Okla. Office became presidential January 1, 1921.

Joseph E. Spurrier to be postmaster at Beaver, Okla., in place of J. A. Miller. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1920.

Levi R. Gray to be postmaster at Dover, Okla., in place of J. L. Lillibridge. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1922.

OREGON.

Amanda E. Bones to be postmaster at Carlton, Oreg., in place of M. O. Vail. Incumbent's commission expired August 26, 1920.

PENNSYLVANIA.

John E. Anthony to be postmaster at East Berlin, Pa. Office became presidential July 1, 1920.

Arnold E. Ewing to be postmaster at Newtown Square, Pa. Office became presidential April 1, 1922.

Edward Bayley to be postmaster at Picture Rocks, Pa. Office became presidential April 1, 1922.

Harry A. Fuellhart to be postmaster at Tidioute, Pa., in place of F. W. Engle, removed.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

Jean C. Sloan to be postmaster at Pendleton, S. C. Incumbent's commission expired March 18, 1922.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

Sadie E. Gustafson to be postmaster at Buffalo Gap, S. Dak. Office became presidential April 1, 1922.

TENNESSEE.

Rufus T. Hickman to be postmaster at Lynnville, Tenn., in place of M. B. Burford, resigned.

Mahlon H. Webb to be postmaster at Pulaski, Tenn., in place of J. S. Gilbreath, deceased.

TEXAS.

James F. Painter to be postmaster at Wolfe City, Tex., in place of W. R. Sharpe. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1922.

UTAH.

Beatrice E. Hemphill to be postmaster at Helper, Utah, in place of T. C. Smiley, removed.

VIRGINIA.

Annie Allee to be postmaster at Temperanceville, Va. Office became presidential January 1, 1922.

WASHINGTON.

William C. Black to be postmaster at Lowell, Wash. Office became presidential January 1, 1921.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 10 (legislative day of April 20), 1922.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

David C. Bennington to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Oklahoma.

POSTMASTERS.

ARIZONA.

William A. Fowler, Tombstone.

CALIFORNIA.

Earl C. McWayne, Firebaugh.

CONNECTICUT.

Paul N. Shaller, Chester.

GEORGIA.

William M. Redman, Jackson.

ILLINOIS.

Ancel R. Dion, Clifton.

Susan Gilman, La Harpe.

NEW JERSEY.

John R. Allaire, Farmingdale.

NEW YORK.

Arthur E. Brundage, Newburgh.

Augustus P. Altmeier, Port Jervis.

OHIO.

Ferne V. Boone, Sterling.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Andrew L. Coffman, Phoenixville.

Florence H. Gray, Rosemont.

Reuben J. Knox, Rutledge.

PORTO RICO.

Leonidas M. Lopez, Camuy.

UTAH.

Stephen F. Stephensen, Riverton.

WYOMING.

David Miller, Cumberland.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, June 10, 1922.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

To Thee, O God, out of the busy voices of life we lift our breath of prayer. Give us the understanding that nourishes, restores, and establishes the way that we should go. The height and the depth, the length and the breadth of Thy nature we do not know, but grant that we may grow toward it with fine apprehension. O prepare us by gain and loss, by joy and sorrow to rise above all things false and to know Thee. When our sunset pales to dusk may the light of the past show us the way and bid us rest. Through Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE.

The SPEAKER. The Chair expects to be absent on Monday and Tuesday of next week, and designates the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] to act as Speaker pro tempore in his absence.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Miss ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the present economic conditions as affecting American homes.

The SPEAKER. The lady from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent to extend her remarks in the RECORD on the present economic conditions as affecting American homes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting an address delivered by the Director General of Railroads before the Western Railway Club at Chicago, Ill., on the aftermath of Federal control.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing an address of the Director General of Railways on the aftermath of Federal control.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, when was the address delivered?

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. It was delivered by Director General Davis on the 15th of May last. It contains some very interesting information and statistics in reference to Federal control and liquidation under Federal control.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. For the present, Mr. Speaker, I will object.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing an address of the Hon. LESTER D. VOLK, Representative from the tenth district of New York, at the annual Memorial Day service, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Long Meadow, Prospect Park, Brooklyn, N. Y., on Sunday, May 28, 1922.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing an address of the gentleman from New York [Mr. VOLK] at the annual Memorial Day service in Brooklyn, N. Y., on Sunday, May 28, 1922. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The address is as follows:

MEMORIAL DAY ADDRESS OF HON. LESTER D. VOLK, REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE TENTH DISTRICT, NEW YORK, AT THE ANNUAL MEMORIAL DAY SERVICE, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES, LONG MEADOW, PROSPECT PARK, BROOKLYN, N. Y., ON SUNDAY, MAY 28, 1922.

Comrades and friends, we are here assembled this Memorial Day to commemorate our Nation's dead—to strew flowers, emblems of peace and love, over their final resting places; to recount their glorious deeds of valor and patriotism; and to express our love and gratitude for their service and devotion.

To all Americans, whether by birth or adoption, Memorial Day should stand out as especially sacred, sanctified, glorified.

As one standing on a high eminence or lofty hill obtains a more extensive view of his surroundings and his thoughts and emotions grow more profound and intensive, so, as each year passes, standing on this eminence, we scan the horizon with greater vision, we hold our Memorial Day with more profound love and with deeper understanding.

Comparatively few years ago Memorial Day was observed in but a small part of this country. On this day a few high-minded women of the North resolved that the graves of the "boys in blue," so sadly neglected and unhonored, should be decorated with flowers and preserved to honor. Gradually this observance grew in extent and significance until it now embraces almost the entire country, and is set aside as a day of consecration and loving tribute the living pay to all our heroic dead.

Lest our Memorial Day shall become a meaningless form, let us ever keep in our hearts and minds the true meaning and significance of this day and these services. Let us feel the sacred inspiration from